The politics on Culture and cultural policies on European Union
Roles and *modi operandi* in european building prospective

1. The concepts of "politics on culture" and "cultural policies"

2. The politics on Culture of European Union: perspectives of a path

3. Cultural policies of European Union: a historical overview

4. The cultural policies of the 27 EU member states

5. The importance of regional and local policies

6. The private sector

7. The Present: the networking society, the globalisation and cultural identities

8. EU as a space of "variable geometry" and stakes on definition of cultural politics and cultural policies for the future

9. EU and Member States: from the "principle of subsidiarity" and "principle of complementarity" to the principle of "european building"

10. Arguing the "european building" concept and its further developments in european union politics and policies

a) The concepts

b) The roles and the agents

c) The *modi operandi*

1. The concepts of "politics on culture" and "cultural policies"

The politics on culture is a composite object, integrating history of ideas, social representations, the State (or other public institutions) evolution, the distribution of power in society and the role in that distribution of the expectations on Culture (individuals and groups). The politics on culture does not reduce itself neither to an certain aggregate of sectorial politics nor to a contemporary revival of royal patronage. It is an coherent ensemble buid by ideas, political and administrative practices in a certain intelectual and political context, with the active (or passive) role of the politicians on charge.[1][2][3][4]

It will be intended to make an overview of politics on culture beetween the period from the end of the II World War to nowadays in Western countries.

The cultural policies are the public policies on Culture. It will be intended to clarify the main processes and domains of cultural policies in Europe, in the quoted period. It will be taken as referencial group the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Italy ann Finland.

2. The politics on Culture of European Union: perspectives of a path[5]

[1] " Culture as Praxis"; Bauman, Zygmunt; SAGE Publications; London; 1999; ISBN 84-493-1184-5
[2] " Pour une refondation de la politique culturelle"; Rigaud, Jacques; Président de la Commission d'étude de la politique culturelle de l'État; Collection dês repports officiels; La documentation française; Paris 1996; ISBN 2-11-003675-3
[3] "The Politics of Aesthetics"; Rancière, Jacques;MPG Books; Cornwall;2006; ISBN: 0-8264-7067-X
[4] Cultural Policy"; Miller, Toby and Yúdice, George; SAGE Publications, London; 2002; ISBN 84-7432-913-2
[5] "Guide to the European Union"; Leonard, Dick; The Economist/Profile Books Ltd.; 9th ed.; 2005; London; ISBN 1-86197-930-4

A long way was done since ECSC Treaty in 1952, the EEC Treaty in 1957 and the most recent integration of Bulgaria and Romania (January 2007) in European Union. 50 years after Rome Treaty, it will be intended to persuit the evolution, in treaties and in the practice of the main european institutions (Council, Commission and Parliament)[6] of the concept of "politics on Culture".

It will not be done a comparative analysis with Council of Europe, UNESCO, or even OECD, NATO, OSCE ou OMC (each one of them, in different ways or importance have credits in this field). These international organisations, beetween others, will be refered only in situations of direct contribution for the politics on Culture and/or cultural policies of European Union.[7]

It will be, briefly, commented the quarrel "european culture", "european civilisation", "european cultural identity".[8]

3. Cultural policies of European Union: a historical overview

It will be intended to identify the diverse moments of cultural policies in European Union[9]. Further more of assumed "cultural policies" a reflection will be done about other policies with "relevant cultural dimension"[10][11] and about studies of EU iniciative about this item.[12][13]

---

[6] It is not refered at the moment the evolution of the three institutions, their names and roles in the related period, what will be done in a further development

[7] "La culture européenne:définitions et enjeux"; Caroline Brossat; Bruylant; 1999, Brussels; ISBN 2-8027-1187-3

[8] "In Search of Cultural History"; E.H.Gombrich; Oxford University Press; 1969

[9] This denomination is utilised with the awarness about its imprecision in order to the time of application or the situation.

[10] The precision of this concept will be assumed in a more developed document.

[11] See note 1, a sintesys of available information in http://ec.europa.eu/culture/eac/index_en.

[12] Michalski Report; see note 2;

4. The cultural policies of the 27 EU member states

It will presented, with an information objective, a very resumed catalogue about the cultural policies in the EU 27 Member States, from 1945 to nowadays. This catalogue will contain the folow elements: identification and period of a Government; the cultural policies of that Government;

---

[13] "The 2007 Communication on culture: Opinion polls confirm that Europeans are generally concerned about the speed of economic and technological change, as well as the phenomenon of globalisation. They feel a loss of identity and often have a sense of disconnection from the European Union. Against this backdrop, there is a growing recognition that the EU must bring itself closer to the citizen and that art and culture can make an important contribution. Indeed, art and culture offer an inspiring way of looking at reality. They can provide a more human dimension to the integration project, a so-called "Soul for Europe ".In this context, the perception and role of culture in the EU is gradually changing. Whereas, in the past, the question was what Europe could do for culture, there is a growing recognition that culture lies at the heart of the European project and has a unique and indispensable role to play. It is therefore increasingly necessary to also ask what culture can do for Europe.The Directorate General for Education and Culture (DG EAC) is preparing a *Communication on culture* which seeks to address these issues.The main purpose of the Communication will be to see both what Europe can do for culture and what culture can do for Europe , with two main sets of objectives in mind:: developing active European citizenship, respecting cultural diversity, promoting intercultural dialogue, while fostering a sense of "European identity" complementary to other identities;the economic and social objectives of the Lisbon agenda, and the role of creativity in enhancing the competitive edge of Europe.The Communication will analyse the various dimensions of the role of culture in the European project, take stock of existing efforts but also identify new challenges and possible new avenues for tackling them, in terms of substance and methods. The aim is both to identify common priorities (a European 'agenda' for culture) and to develop new frameworks and methods for dialogue and cooperation.The Communication will be adopted by the Commission in the first quarter of 2007 and will launch a broad consultation with all interested parties, which is intended to stimulate the Commission's future work." In http://ec.europa.eu/culture/eac/index_en.html

5. The importance of regional and local policies

The importance of european regions and municipalities is growing. It is not the object of this study, but it is not possible to ignore their role in conceptualisation and cultural practices. The explanation of its role in this field is helpfull to delimitate , in adiction to chapters 4 and 6, the specificity of EU role. It will be taken three regions and three municipalities as references, trying to identify their thoughts and practices on Culture, at the present time. It was choosed the regions of Catalunya, Bavaria and Central London and the municipalities of Bilbao, Kassel and Siena.[14]

6. The private sector

The private sector (profit and non-profit[15]) is empowring its role on Culture. It is necessary to situate its position in relation with the map of cultural politics and policies.[16]

7. The Present: the networking society, the globalisation and cultural identities

In this chapter, it is intended to promote the reflexion about the "paralel reality" or "cumulative reality" in relation with the refered domains, that represents the individuals and comunitaries experiences

---

[14] "Regional Strategies. On spatial aspects of european cultural policy"; Minichbauer, Raimund; www.eipcp.net; 2004;

[15] The Johns Hopkins University Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project, Lester M. Salamon, Director, Center for Civil Society Studies; 2005, USA

[16] "Culture and Economy in Europe", KEA European Affairs, for European Commission, 2006; see Note 3;

of networking in the globalisation, with the actual conflict of cultural identities. How they can help or dificult processes of public politics and policies? How they can interact with them?[17][18][19][20]

8. EU as a space of "variable geometry" and stakes on definition of cultural politics and cultural policies for the future

The constantly growing space of EU poses a wider range of difficulties in the stablishment of coehison politics and policies, also in Culture. It is possible to create policies of "variable geometry" in this field? How create these policies without the consequence of a EU at different speeds?Which advantages in the exploitation of this concept?[21]

9. EU and Member States: from the "principles of subsidiarity and complementarity" to the "principle of european building"

[22]The **Treaty of Rome** (1957) did not contain a specific chapter or

---

[17] "The rise of network society"; Castells, Manuel; Blackwell Publishers Ltd.; Iowa;1996; ISBN 972-31-0984-0

[18] "The Internet Galaxy";Castells, Manuel; Oxford University Press; 2001; ISBN 972-31-1065-2

[19] "La mondialisation de la Culture"; Warnier, Jean-Pierre; Éditions La Découverte et Syros; 1998; ISBN 2-7071-2939-0

[20] "The Skin of Culture: investigating the new electronic reality"; Kerckhove, Derrick de; Somerville House Books Ltd

[21] "Why we need European cultural policies- the impacto f EU enlargement on cultural policies in transition countries"; Obuljen, Nina; European Cultural Foundation, www.eurocult.org, 2005

[22] ITZEL. Constanze; European Parliament fact sheets; 2005

paragraph concerning cultural policy. Only in the preamble to the Treaty was there a reference to culture as a factor capable of uniting people and promoting social and economic development.

The **Maastricht Treaty** (1992) gave cultural policy its own legal basis. Article 151 provides a basis for action aimed at encouraging, supporting and supplementing the activities of the Member States, while respecting national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore. The principles for intervention by the EU in the field of culture are complementarity and subsidiarity. Any act of harmonisation of legal and regulatory provisions of the Member States is excluded from the scope of Article 151. Measures are taken by the codecision procedure with unanimity in Council.

Article 13 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights stipulates that 'The arts and scientific research shall be free of constraint'. Article 22 of the **Charter of Fundamental Rights** stipulates that 'the...EU shall respect cultural, religious and linguistic diversity'.

The **Constitutional Treaty**, Article III-180 of which is devoted to culture, recommends the application of **qualified majority voting**.

The " principle of european building" looks for a pro-active construction of European common cultural heritage. It is not a given heritage – it is the present challenge of building a common heritage. In addition to the "acquis communautaire", the procedure of a "principle of european building" here argued seeks a theoretical and practicising field for cultural politics and cultural policies that is neither in competition with national politics or policies, or a way for

subsidiarity or complementarity interventions. It is the possibility of a new perspective.

10.   Arguing the "european building" concept and its further developments in EU politics and policies

In the final chapter, it will be intended to demonstrate de possibilities of this point of view in three focus:

a)The concepts

b)The roles and the agents

c)The *modi operandi*

NOTES

Note 1

History

Up until the Treaty of Maastricht (1992), the Community had no real power in the field of culture. However, culture was still represented in Community activities through ad hoc initiatives.

In 1993, the entry into force of the Treaty of Maastricht marked the Member States' desire to "mark a new stage in the process of European integration", that of "an ever closer union between the peoples of Europe", expressed in particular via the creation of a European citizenship and by the granting of new powers to the Community, including new powers in the field of culture, with the Treaty introducing a new article devoted to it. Cultural cooperation thus became a recognised aim of Community action, with an appropriate legal basis (article 128).

This article was included in its entirety in the Treaty of Amsterdam (1997)(article 151), apart from paragraph 4 which was amended to read as follows: "the Community shall take cultural aspects into account in its actions under other provisions of this Treaty, in particular in order to respect and to promote the diversity of its cultures".This paragraph calls for culture to be taken into account and for cultural diversity to be respected in all Community policies, in compliance with Community law. This is a legal obligation, and the Community institutions must take the cultural implications of all Community policies on board.

Based on Article 151 (ex-128), a first generation of programmes, first of all pilot and then sectoral programmes, were put in place between 1993 and 1999.

In July 1990, the Commission published the selection criteria and conditions for participation in the "Platform Europe", which became in 1991 the first Kaléidoscope programme for supporting artistic and cultural events involving at least three Member States. The programme was reorganised from 1994 in order to support cultural events more effectively, encourage artistic creation and cooperation in the form of a

network, to promote better public access to European heritage and to improve artistic and cultural cooperation between professionals. Between 1990 and 1995, more than 500 cultural projects received Community support.

Between 1990 and 1996, the Commission also launched several pilot projects in the area of translation and the promotion of books in Europe, providing support for more than 500 projects or translations.

These pilots allowed the implementation, between 1996 and 1999, of three cultural programmes:

- Kaléidoscope (1996-1999), which aimed to encourage artistic and cultural creation and cooperation with a European dimension; - Ariane (1997-1999), which supported the field of books and reading, including translation;- Raphaël (1997-1999), the aim of which was to complement Member States' policies in the area of cultural heritage of European significance.

Finally, preparatory actions were performed in 1999 in order to manage the preparation of Culture 2000.

Kaléidoscope

The European Parliament and the Council of Ministers adopted the Kaléidoscope programme on 29 March 1996 for a period of 3 years (1996-1998), with a global budget of 26.5 million euro. It was extended in 1999 with a budget of 10.2 million euro. 518 projects were funded over these four years. The European City of Culture and the European Cultural Month were also supported, as well as the activities of the European Union Baroque Orchestra and the European Union Youth Orchestra.The programme, prepared for by way of pilot activities between 1990 and 1995, was intended to encourage artistic and cultural creation in Europe through cooperation. Its aim was to support projects with a European dimension, i.e. implemented in partnership with bodies in various Member States, in order to promote knowledge and the dissemination of the culture and cultural life of the European peoples, to contribute to professional training for artists and other cultural operators and to facilitate access to culture for all.The sectors covered by the programme were: the performing arts (dance, theatre, music, opera, etc.), the plastic

and visual arts (painting, sculpture, architecture, carving), the applied arts (photography, design) as well as projects involving multimedia as a form of artistic expression.

Ariane

Ariane was a programme to support the books and reading sector, including translation. Adopted for two years (1997-1998) and allocated a budget of 7 million euro, it was extended for one year in 1999, with a budget of 4.1 million euro. Altogether, Ariane supported 767 translations of literature, plays and reference works, cooperation and professional training projects. The European Literary Prize and the European Translation Prize, known as the "Aristeion Prize", were also supported.The programme's aims were as follows: · to encourage cooperation between the Member States in the field of books and reading and to complement their activities in this area, by contributing to the development of their cultures while respecting national and regional diversity;· to increase the knowledge and dissemination of the literature and history of the European peoples, notably through support for the translation of literary works, plays and reference works, support for cooperation projects carried out in partnership and improvement of the skills of professionals in this field.

Raphael

Raphael was a Community action programme in the field of heritage. Adopted for four years (1997-2000) with a budget of 30 million euro, it ended in 1999. Its aim was to encourage cooperation for the protection, conservation and enhancement of Europe's cultural heritage, raising citizens' awareness of cultural heritage and facilitating their access to it. The main sectors covered by the programme were movable and immovable heritage (museums, collections, libraries and archives, including photographic, film and audio archives), archaeological and undersea heritage, architectural heritage and cultural landscapes (natural and cultural objects). It supported a total of almost 360 projects relating to the conservation and enhancement of heritage, involving more than 1 500 operators from all over Europe. The European heritage laboratories were also supported.

Action Connect

Connect was a measure to support projects associating culture and the fields of education and training, in conjunction with research and the new technologies. 91 projects were supported in 1999 (out of 510 submitted) for a total of 15 million euro. These projects concerned 860 cultural operators in the Member States.The May 1999 call for proposals centred on education: promoting European citizenship at the level of civic life, democratic values, language learning, etc. The 60 projects chosen were granted 8.4 million euro. The June 1999 call for proposals focused on cultural activities. The Commission selected 31 projects out of 243 submitted. These projects received Community funding of 7.038 million euro. They concerned, in particular, the performing arts, cultural heritage, the visual and spatial arts.: - 18 culture and education projects, designed and administered by professionals and aimed at young people, even children, in order to interest them in culture, and/or using the new technologies in a teaching perspective (4.28 million euro), - 13 culture and education/professional training projects for creators, artists and other culture professionals, using innovative techniques and teaching methods (2.75 million euro).

Preparatory action for Culture 2000
In June 1999, the Commission published a call for applications for experimental measures in anticipation of the Culture 2000 programme. The European Union thus contributed to 55 cultural projects, which received a total of 6.07 million euro. Of the 410 applications submitted, the Commission selected 55, following the opinion of a panel of independent experts representing several cultural disciplines. More than 270 cultural operators from the Member States of the Union and the countries of the European Economic Area were involved in these projects.

Three types of experimental measures were distinguished, defined on the basis of the proposal for a Decision on Culture 2000, which was being negotiated at the time:Measure 1: Experimental measures designed to test the implementation of specific and innovative projects in the culture field. Of the 266 applications submitted under this measure, 42 projects were selected for a total amount of more than 3 million euro.Measure 2: Experimental measures covered by structured, multiannual transnational cultural cooperation agreements. Of the 79 applications submitted under this measure, 10 projects were selected for a total amount of 2.2 million

euro.Measure 3: Experimental measures designed to try out the organisation of special cultural events with a European and/or international dimension. To mark the celebration in 2000 of the 250th anniversary of the death of J.S. Bach, the Community support was earmarked for projects relating to the knowledge and dissemination of the works of this great figure in German and European music. Of the 65 applications submitted under this measure, 3 large-scale projects were selected for a total amount of 800 000 euro.

Culture 2000

The first strand of the Culture 2000 Programme provides support for several types of annual project:

- cooperation projects involving partners from at least three participating countries and lasting, in principle, for one year; - translation projects.The Community support may not exceed 50 % of the eligible budget for a specific action. In most cases, it may not be less than 50 000 euro or more than 150 000 euro a year.The programme supports cooperation projects not only in the participating countries but also in third countries.

233 European cultural projects have been offered grants in 2004 under the Culture 2000 programme

233 projects have been offered grants, most of which focus on cultural heritage, the priority field in 2004. They will share approximately 32 million euro in funding. 30 European countries are taking part in Culture 2000 (2000-2006), which, this year, is helping more than 850 cultural operators to work together on projects with a European dimension.

Culture 2000 is the Commission's cultural programme and supports annual as well as multi-annual cooperation projects, thus encouraging and promoting the establishment of European cultural networks. In 2004, **209 annual projects** have been selected to a total of around 18.5 million euro, as well as **24 multi-annual cooperation projects** (focusing on the visual arts, performing arts, cultural heritage, books and reading) to a total of around 13.5 million euro. In addition to the twenty-five Member States of the EU and the EEA (Iceland, Liechtenstein,

Norway) countries, two candidate countries (Bulgaria and Romania) participated in the programme.

Of the 233 projects that have been proposed for selection in 2004, 113 concern **cultural heritage**, the priority this year.

Ján Figel, European Commissioner for Education, Training, Culture and Multilingualism, said : "Once again, the projects selected in the framework of the Culture 2000 programme are an illustration of the extreme diversity of European cultures. The selected projects will actively participate in the constant development of pan-European cooperation in the field of culture."

Annual cooperation projects in 2004

These projects must involve at least three co-organisers in the countries taking part in the programme. The 209 projects proposed for selection under this action break down as follows:

  Cultural heritage: 89 projects
  Cultural heritage in third countries: 6 projects
  Translation: 68 projects (nearly 400 books)
  Performing arts: 23 projects
  Visual arts: 13 projects
  Books and reading: 9 projects
  Cultural heritage laboratories: 1 project

Multi annual cooperation projects

These projects must involve at least five co-organisers in the countries taking part in the programme. The 24 projects selected break down as follows:

  Cultural heritage: 17 projects
- Performing arts: 3 projects

  Visual arts: 2 projects
  Books and reading: 2 projects

The **European Capitals of Culture** for 2004, Lille and Genoa, have received 250 000 euro for preparatory activities, and an additional sum of 750 000 euro for activities which are taking place this year.

Co-operation in Third Countries

Culture 2000 also promotes cooperation with cultural operators in third countries. This year six projects were selected under that action.

For 2005 - 2006, the programme will support projects in all artistic and cultural fields without a sector priority.

The European Commission has proposed in July 2004 a new cultural cooperation programme for the period 2007-2013 which will concentrate on three priorities : mobility of artists and cultural workers, mobility of works and intercultural dialogue. A little over **400 million** euros have been proposed for this new programme.

A list with the description of the funded projects is available at:

http://europa.eu.int/comm/culture/eac/index_en.html

The second strand of the Culture 2000 programme supports multiannual cultural cooperation development projects designed and implemented by cultural operators from at least five countries participating in the programme. These projects can be supported for a maximum period of three years.

The Culture 2000 programme thus promotes cooperation by supporting networks of operators, culture organisations, culture institutions, etc. with a view to implementing structured culture projects within and outside the Community. This measure concerns important, high quality projects with a European dimension: - transnational actions in a cultural field (vertical actions) such as music, the performing arts, the visual and spatial arts, literature, books and reading, including translation, and cultural heritage;- trans-sectoral integrated actions (horizontal actions based on synergies), in other words, bringing together several cultural fields, including support for the use of the new media.The Community support may not exceed 60 % of the cultural cooperation agreement's eligible budget. It may not be more than 300 000 euro a year.

For actions 1 and actions 2 of the programme, an annual call for

proposals is published in the Official Journal of the European Communities.

To apply for funding under these two actions, you have to complete the forms provided with the call and return them by the deadline set.
The call for proposals for annual and multiannual projects beginning in 2006 has been published in the Official Journal `OJ C 172 on 12.07.2005`.

The deadlines for submission of applications for Community funding were:`17 October 2005 for annual and translation projects``28 October 2005 for multi-annual projects and cooperation projects in third` countries.

The third strand

The third strand of the Culture 2000 framework programme provides support for large-scale events which should strike a significant chord with the peoples of Europe and help to increase their sense of belonging to the same community, as well as making them aware of the cultural diversity of the Member States and intercultural and international dialogue.In the context of this strand, Culture 2000 supports the European Capitals of Culture, the award of two European prizes in the fields of architecture and heritage aimed at promoting the recognition and development of artistic talent in Europe, in particular among young people, the European heritage laboratories, the European Heritage days - in cooperation with the Council of Europe -, as well as one-off actions such as the European presence during the 2003 tercentenary celebrations in St. Petersburg.

This strand also provided support for events such as : The 2004 EU enlargement A European presence during the 2003 tercentenary celebrations in St. Petersburg. The Bach Year in 1999 and the Verdi Year in 2001.

In 2005, cultural cooperation projects taking place in Japan will be funded under this strand.

As far as actions 3 of the programme are concerned, the procedure to follow in order to take part varies with each action. For example, for the action "2005 EU-Japan", a restricted call for proposals was sent to the

national authorities of all the countries participating in Culture 2000.

Regarding the EU Prize for Architecture and the EU Prize for cultural heritage, the Mies van der Rohe and Europa Nostra associations, in charge of their implementation, were selected via two calls for tenders.

As for the "European Heritage Laboratories", the Commission invites each year the competent authorities of the Member States and countries participating in the Culture 2000 programme to submit projects that could be granted such a qualification.2006 - Cultural Heritage Laboratory / List of projects submitted and proposed for funding

Conditions of the Culture 2000 programme and the European Commission's new Financial Regulations.

 For full information about the new Financial Regulations, applicants should refer to:http://europa.eu/eur-lex/en/search/search_oj.htmland search for the following two Official Journals:

- Date: 09/2002. Official Journal Series/Number: L/248 (Council Regulation No 1605/2002 of 25 June 2002 on the Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget of the European Communities)- Date: 12/2002. Official Journal Series/Number: L/357 (Commission Regulation No.2342/2002 of 23 December 2002 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation No.1605/2002 on the Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget of the European Communities).

- **Please find below the lists of all the cultural operators that took part in Culture 2000 as project leaders (1st list), co-organisers or associated partners (2nd list).**

1st list: Cultural operators that took part in Culture 2000 **in 2000, 2001 and/or 2002** as project leaders. (xls format) (pdf format)

Cultural operators that took part in Culture 2000 **in 2003 and/or 2004** as project leaders. ([xls format](#))

 Cultural operators that took part in Culture 2000 **in 2005** as project leaders. ([xls format](#))

2nd list: Cultural operators that took part in Culture 2000 **in 2000, 2001 and/or 2002** as co-organisers or associated partners. ([xls format](#)) ([pdf format](#))

Cultural operators that took part in Culture 2000 **in 2003 and/or 2004** as co-organisers or associated partners. ([xls format](#))

 Cultural operators that took part in Culture 2000 **in 2005** as co-organisers or associated partners. ([xls format](#))

OTHERS ACTIONS

European Capitals of Culture

Designed to "contribute to bringing the peoples of Europe together", the European City of Culture project was launched, at the initiative of Melina Mercouri, by the Council of Ministers on 13 June 1985. It has become ever more popular with the citizens of Europe and has seen its cultural and socio-economic influence grow through the many visitors it has attracted.

The European Cities of Culture have been chosen until 2004, on an intergovernmental basis; the Member States unanimously selected cities worthy of hosting the event, and the European Commission awarded a grant each year to the city selected. For the time being, the European Capitals of Culture are designated each year by the Council of Ministers of the EU, on the basis of the view of a selection panel comprising seven prominent independent members, each of them experts in the culture sector.The selection procedure is laid down in Decision 1419/1999/CE amended by Decision 649/2005/CE. This Decision sets out a chronological list of Member States entitling them to host the event in turn. It defines as well the criteria the cities have to comply with to be designated as European Capital of Culture.

A new designation procedure will apply for the 2013 title onwards. Indeed, a new Decision has been adopted by the European Parliament and the Council. Its fosters national competition within the Member States, sets up a monitoring phase after the designation and strengthens the European dimension of the event.

Many cities have already held the title of European City/Capital of Culture or have hosted the European Cultural Month event.

OVERVIEW OF THE EUROPEAN CITIES AND CAPITALS OF CULTURE

1985: Athens	1990: Glasgow	1995: Luxembou
1986: Florence	1991: Dublin	1996: Copenhag
1987: Amsterdam	1992: Madrid	1997: Thessalon
1988: Berlin	1993: Antwerp	1998: Stockholm
1989: Paris	1994: Lisbon	1999: Weimar

2000: Avignon, Bergen, Bologna, Brussels, Helsinki, Cracow, Reykjavik, Prague, Santiago d

2001: Porto + Rotterdam	2003: Graz
2002: Bruges + Salamanca	2004: Genova + Lille
2005: Cork	2006: Patras
2007: Luxembourg + Sibiu	2008: Liverpool + Stavanger

THE EUROPEAN CULTURAL MONTHS

1992: Cracow	1995: Nicosia	1998: Linz, Vale
1993: Graz	1996: St.-Petersburg	1999: Plovdiv
1994: Budapest	1997: Ljubljana	2000: ———

2001: Basel + Riga

Support of cultural organizations of European interest

The European Parliament and the Council adopted a Decision establishing a Community action programme to promote bodies active at European level in the field of culture in April 2004. Following the adoption of an EU Council Regulation on the financial regulation applicable to the general budget of the European Communities, **the purpose of this Decision is** to provide a basis for grants to promote bodies active at European level and support specific activities in the field of culture.

This action takes 3 forms:- **Part 1**: Permanent activities of the following bodies pursuing an aim of general European interest in the field of culture: European Bureau for Lesser Used Languages and the centres Mercator information network.- **Part 2**: Permanent activities of other bodies pursuing an aim of general European interest in the field of culture or an objective forming part of the European Union's policy in this area.- **Part 3**: Actions to preserve and commemorate the main sites and archives associated with the deportations, symbolised by the memorials which have been raised on the sites of the former camps and other places of mass-civilian martyrdom and extermination, and to keep alive the memory of the victims at these sites.

Experimental actions

From 2002 to 2004, the EC budget included funds for preparatory actions for cooperation on cultural matters. This appropriation had a limited budget (2,1 million euros in 2004) and was intended to finance measures aimed at developing cultural cooperation.

According to EC budgetary rules, funds relating to preparatory actions are intended to prepare proposals with a view to the adoption of future Community actions. These funds may only be entered in the budget for a maximum of three financial years.

In 2002 these funds were used to finance several studies, and to support two experimental projects: the first aimed to study the feasibility of networking national export structures in the music industry, and the second was concerned with developing a website for information on the mobility of artists

In 2003 the funds have been used mostly for supporting projects in the

framework of a call for proposals. This call has been published in the Official Journal OJ C 217 on 12.09.2003.

The European Commission has finalised the examination of proposals submitted under the Call for proposals under the special budgetary line 'Preparatory actions for cooperation on cultural matters' . 6 projects have been selected, under 4 different themes of the call. They have various budgets and thus have received various EU grants.Presentation of the 6 selected projects (pdf format)

In 2004 the funds have been used for supporting projects selected in the framework of a call for proposals, published in the OJ C174 of 6 July 2004. Presentation of the selected projects

You will find below information on events organised in the field of cultural cooperation on the initiative of the European Commission or with its collaboration.

Seminary on the mobility of artists in Europe, Aahrus, 7 September 2002

Seminary on cultural sponsorship in Europe, Madrid, 8 and 9 April 2002

Forum on cultural cooperation in Europe, Brussels, 21and 22 November 2001

Seminary on music in Europe, Brussels, 13 October 2001

After 2006

For the past few years the Commission has been preparing the post-2006 future of the Community action in the field of cultural cooperation.

Evaluations and studies, as well as a public consultation organised in 2003, are part of this preparation work.

Moreover, in March 2004 the Commission adopted a Communication entitled "Citizenship in action" (pdf format), setting out the guidelines for

the future new generation programme intended to replace the current Community programme Culture 2000.

On the basis of these preliminary works, the Commission proposed a Decision for a new "Culture 2007" programme. The proposal was submitted to the European Parliament and the Council in July 2004 and will be discussed according to the co-decision procedure.

The new Culture Programme
Conditional call for proposals — EACEA No 06/ 2006 — Support for bodies active at European level in the field of culture

lture 2007

   Introduction

   Culture 2007 in detail

   To help you make an application:

   Advice on your ideas

   Workshops and surgeries

   Guidance documents

   Important Links (to the EU website, to help you find partners, to other EU funding programmes, etc.)

Introduction

Culture 2007 is a **funding programme** from the European Union. It replaces Culture 2000 which has now closed.

TIMETABLE FOR FIRST CALL

   Conditional call now out

   22 Dec 2006 deadline for applications for European networks and agencies

   28 Feb 2007 deadline for all project applications (both 1-2 year co-operation projects and 3-5 year multi-annual co-operation projects)

   Results to be announced between May and July 2007 - 1-2 year projects announced first (June ?) and then multi-annual projects (July ?)

   1-2 year co-operation projects to start in **summer 2007**

   Multi-annual co-operation projects to start in **autumn 2007**

The key features of the Culture 2007 programme are set out below.

In summary, to be eligible for support from Culture 2007, projects will need to meet the following criteria:

- They can be focused on any cultural area - there are now no separate strands for different cultural areas - proposals can cover any cultural area, or can link together different cultural areas to generate unique and innovative projects
- They must have something uniquely **European** about them (i.e. not just a tour of a UK performance or exhibition)
- They must be developed and implemented by **at least 3 partner organisations from 3 different eligible countries** (currently the 25 Member States, plus Norway, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Bulgaria and Romania – and also new "candidate countries" including Croatia and Turkey)
- They can last either for **1-2 years** or, in exceptional cases, for **3-5 years**
- They are likely to have a total budget of between €100-400,000 (1 year projects) or up to €1m per year (3-5 year projects)
- They can receive, from Culture 2007, a maximum of **50%** of the total budget for the project
- They cannot spend project funds on buildings or buying new equipment - Culture 2007 can only fund projects

CULTURE 2007 in detail

Broad Aim The Culture 2007 programme is intended as "*a coherent, global and complete tool for multicultural cooperation in Europe and should contribute actively to the development of a European identity from the grassroots*".

Objectives The general objective of the programme shall be "to enhance the cultural area shared by Europeans and based on a common cultural heritage through the development of cultural cooperation between the creators, cultural players and cultural institutions, of the countries taking part in the Programme with a view to encouraging the emergence of European citizenship".

The **specific objectives** of the Programme are:

- to promote the transnational mobility of people working in the cultural sector
- to encourage the transnational circulation of works and cultural and artistic products
- to encourage intercultural dialogue

Contribution to other European Community objectives It is noted that it is stated that Culture 2007 shall contribute to the strengthening of the transversal objectives of the European Community, in particular by:

(a) promoting the fundamental principle of freedom of expression;

(b) encouraging greater awareness of the importance of contributing to sustainable development;

(c) seeking to promote mutual understanding and tolerance within the European Union;

(d) contributing to the elimination of all discrimination based on gender, race or ethnic origin, religion or convictions, disability, age or sexual orientation.

It is also stated that "particular attention will be given to coherence and complementarity between the Programme and Community policies in the field of cultural cooperation with third countries".

Funding Strands There are actually three funding strands, though most UK cultural operators will be interested in the first, which is described in more detail below.

- support for cultural actions
- support for bodies active at European level in the field of culture (*e.g. European cultural networks*)
- support for analyses and the collection and dissemination of information and for activities maximising the impact of projects in the field of European cultural cooperation and European cultural policy developments

Cultural Sectors

Note that in Culture 2007 there are no separate strands for different cultural sectors. Projects can focus on one cultural sector (e.g. music, photography, heritage, etc.) or be cross-sectoral, i.e. encompass several sectors.

The programme is also open to the participation of non-audiovisual cultural industries, in particular small cultural enterprises, where such industries are acting in a non-profit-making cultural capacity.

Description of Support for Cultural Actions

CO-OPERATION MEASURES (i.e. *smaller projects - lasting 1-2 years*)This will cover support for sectoral or cross-sectoral cultural cooperation actions between European cultural operators.

Priority to be given to "creativity and innovation".

Projects which explore avenues for cooperation in order to develop them over the longer term will be "particularly encouraged".

Minimum number of partners At least **three** cultural operators in three different participating countries, noting that the operators may come from one or more cultural sectors.

*Duration of project*This support shall be granted for a **maximum of 24 months**.

*Amount of support*Financial support from the EU may not exceed 50% of the project budget. It may not be less than 50 000 euro nor more than 200 000 euro (for the whole of the project, i.e. up to 24 months).

MULTI-ANNUAL CO-OPERATION PROJECTS (*i.e. larger projects - lasting 3-5 years*)This will cover "sustainable and structured cultural cooperation projects in order to bring together the specific quality and expertise of cultural operators throughout the whole of Europe". This support is intended to assist projects in their start-up and structuring phase or in their geographical extension phase. The aim is to encourage them to establish sustainable foundations and achieve financial autonomy.

Its purpose shall be to bring together a variety of operators from one or more sectors for various multi-annual activities, which may be sectoral or

cross-sectoral in nature but which must pursue a common objective.

Each cooperation project shall be intended to carry out a number of structured, multi-annual cultural activities. These activities are to be implemented throughout the duration of the project.

Each project must address at least two of the three specific objectives indicated above. However, priority will be given to cooperation projects intending to develop activities meeting all three of these specific objectives.

Minimum number of partners At least **six** operators from six different eligible countries.

Duration of project This support shall be granted for a period of **three to five years**.

Cooperation agreement These projects must be founded on a cooperation agreement, i.e. a common document with a legal form in one of the participating countries and signed by all co-organisers.

Amount of support Financial support from the EU may not exceed 50% of the project budget and shall be "degressive" in nature. It may not be more than 500 000 euro per year for all activities of the cooperation projects.

Countries Eligible to Participate

the 25 member states of the EU

accession countries due to oin the EU on a specific date (*i.e. Bulgaria and Romania*)

those EFTA countries which are members of the EEA, in accordance with the provisions of the EEA agreement (*i.e. Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein*)

candidate countries benefiting from a pre-accession strategy for entry to the European Union, in accordance with the general principles and with the general conditions and procedures for the participation of these countries in the Community programmes established in the framework agreements

the countries of the Western Balkans in accordance with the procedures defined with these countries following the framework agreements

providing for their participation in Community programmes.

The last two points cover Croatia and Turkey, and perhaps also FYROM (Macedonia).

Selection criteria Selection will be made on the basis of the recognised expertise of co-organisers, their financial and operational capacity to carry out the proposed activities, the quality of these activities and the extent to which they meet the general objective and specific objectives of the Programme.

There will be slightly different criteria for literary translation projects.

Financial provisions Applicants must be organisations. It is technically possible (but in reality unlikely) that grants can be awarded to individuals.

It is also noted that specific activities by the European Capitals of Culture (e.g. Liverpool) may receive a grant under the Culture 2007 programme.

Further updates will be announced in our FREE Alert! e-newsletter (<u>click here</u> to register to receive Alert!)

To Help You Make an Application

1. ADVICE ON YOUR IDEAS

EUCLID has been appointed by the European Commission and the UK government as the official UK "Cultural Contact Point" (CCP) – there is a CCP in each of the countries eligible to participate in the Culture 2007 programme (**click here** to access a list of all CCPs). As UK CCP, EUCLID provides advice and support to anyone in the UK considering or preparing a Culture 2007 application. Contact us by email or phone as follows: E-mail: <u>info@euclid.info</u> Phone: **07000 EUCLID (382 543)**

Talk to us about your ideas, or send us an outline proposal. Once the call is announced and you have started filling in the form, we are also available to review your application and your budget proposals. We are here to help stimulate the greatest number of successful UK applications and we will do all we can to help you. Please note the **Important Links** section at the bottom of this webpage – there are many helpful links here, including to the official "**Partner Search Database**" and to the **CUPID** database of previous successful projects.

2. WORKSHOPS & SURGERIES When each call is announced, EUCLID offers workshops and surgery sessions in England, Scotland, Wales & NI for those considering making an application. Full details of future workshops will be contained in our FREE *Alert!* e-newsletter (click here to register to receive *Alert!*).

3. GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS

Please note that, until the first call for Culture 2007 is officially announced (hopefully sometime in 2006), the following links are to guidance documents prepared for the previous call (i.e. the last call for Culture 2000). However, there are many similarities between this call for Culture 2000 and the likely first call for Culture 2007 so these documents will still be helpful in enabling you to start preparing your project now.

Summary of the Call

General Objectives; Key Themes; Annual Sectoral Approach

Deadlines; Partner Countries; Terminology

Criteria: overall, specific (performing arts, visual arts, heritage, books & translation) & common

Summary of the Call (alpha order)

As above, but with topics listed in alphabetical order.

Completing the Application Form

Background on the form, and then page-by-page guidance on completing each question, with extra advice and hints.

(please note the above are in PDF – you will require Acrobat Reader to read these files – if you do not have this, click here to download)

Budget Estimator (in Excel)

If you need help with filling in the budget section of the application form, click here to download our Budget Estimator. To download an example of a completed Budget Estimator - click here . Both documents are in Excel format. Please note that this is simply a guidance document and is not part of the official application process.

Culture Programme (2007-2013)

Support for cultural actions

Strand 1.1 Multi-annual Co-operation Projects
Strand 1.2.1 Co-operation Measures
Strand 1.2.2 Literary Translation
Deadline:28/02/2007

Precautionary clause

The European Commission proposal relating to the Culture programme has not yet been formally adopted by the EU legislator. Nevertheless, to enable prompt implementation of this programme after the adoption of its legal basis, which should take place soon, and to enable potential beneficiaries of Community grants to prepare their proposals as soon as possible, the European Commission has decided to publish conditional calls for proposals.These calls for proposals do not legally bind the European Commission. They may be cancelled and calls for proposals with different specifications may be issued, with appropriate reply periods, if there is a substantial change in the legal basis by the European decision-making authorities. More generally, the implementation of the calls for proposals in 2007 is subject to the following conditions which are not dependent on the European Commission:

- the adoption by the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union of the final text of the legal basis establishing the Programme without any substantial modifications;
- the adoption of the annual work programme relating to the Culture programme and of the general implementation guidelines and the selection criteria and procedures, after referral to the programme committee; and
- the adoption of the 2007 budget for the European Union by the budgetary authority.

Conditional call for proposals EACEA 09/2006: Strands 1.1 and 1.2.1

It should be noted that the selection procedure will last several months. It guarantees the transparency of the Community action and provides the stringency needed to ensure that public funds are used appropriately.

Note 2

The Spiritual and Cultural Dimension of Europe

Reflection Group
initiated by the
President of the European Commission
and coordinated by the
Institute for Human Sciences
Institute for
Human Sciences
Vienna / Brussels, October 2004
Concluding Remarks
by Kurt Biedenkopf,
Bronislaw Geremek and
Krzysztof Michalski
1
This Report represents the opinion of some members the High-Level Advisory Group only
and does not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission.
2
Préface
The European Union has undergone extensive enlargement in the last ten years.
But at the same time the deepening process has continued, so much so that the Union
is about to give itself a new Constitution of its own.
It was with this momentous sequence of events in mind that I felt it was essential for a
group of enlightened thinkers, free of all constraints, to reflect on the role that the most

deep-rooted values of our shared historical background could play as the binding agent
of fellowship and solidarity.

The report presented here is the fruit of their reflections.

It offers an uncompromising diagnosis that remains free of superficial alarmism.

It raises quite a number of questions, particularly as to the power, looking beyond
statements of principle, of the links, the presence, the latent force of what I am inclined
to call inspiration by fundamental values at the core of the European venture and its
daily practice.

These are healthy questions and it would be a great mistake to ignore them.

Accepting this starting point in all intellectual humility is the condition, as the report
emphasises, for the emergence of avenues to be explored and of guidelines for action
that all deserve thorough study and all deserve the most serious consideration.

This will not, and cannot, be the virtually exclusive prerogative of the Brussels
institutional set-up.

We need to secure the involvement of civil society, of centres of learning, memory and
research, of places where religious faith and humanist convictions are expressed, of
political parties, of associations etc. all networking in a context that is less remote from
the Parliaments and Institutions.

This is at the same time both a major project and a demand for particular patterns of
thought and conduct addressed to all the active forces at work in this Europe of ours.

I offer my warmest thanks to all the personalities who, through their regularly
passionate discussions and valuable individual contribution,s have done so much to
bring this report into being.

I want this report to be a starting point, and I shall work to see that it is.
The starting point for a great debate throughout Europe to place our spiritual, religious
and cultural values ever more firmly at the centre of a European venture that offers
more and more achievements and more and more promises.

Romano Prodi

3

The Work of the Reflection Group on the Spiritual and Cultural Dimension of

Europe

Introduction

In the spring of 2002, the President of the European Commission, Romano Prodi, asked
the Institut für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen (Institute for Human Sciences) in
Vienna to set up a group of Europeans to reflect on those values that are particularly
relevant to the continuing process of European unification and to advise him in this field.
The people concerned should be independent individuals, not representatives of political
parties, churches or other organisations, people with intellectual credentials, political
experience and a stature transcending that of the political parties in their countries.
Over the next few weeks the group was set up and soon started work. Its members
are: Kurt Biedenkopf, Silvio Ferrari, Bronislaw Geremek, Arpad Göncz, John Gray, Will
Hutton, Jutta Limbach, Krzysztof Michalski, Ioannis Petrou, Alberto Quadrio Curzio, Michel
Rocard and Simone Veil.
We have decided to direct our attention at a few specific areas that may be core issues in
the process of European integration.
- One of them is, of course, the enlargement of the Union to include the countries of the
former Soviet empire. How will this process alter the *conditions of European solidarity*?

- The issue of *Europe's religions* may, we felt, be of particular interest in this context.
This issue was to become our second main topic. Particular attention was paid to the role
of Islam in the European public sphere.
- If it is our aim to reflect on Europe as a project we cannot, of course, neglect the issue of
Europe's role in the world. What tasks could emerge for Europe from its new self-image,
which may need further clarification? Are the existing institutions – at both European and
international level – consistent with this new self-image? What options are there when it
comes to developing relations between the new Europe and the Others, particularly the
United States of America? These interrelated issues constituted our third set of topics.
With the European Commission's support, the Group has repeatedly met with experts on
each set of issues. Additionally, in order to involve from the very outset as broad a swathe
of the general public as possible in our discussions, rather than presenting them with a *fait
accompli*, the Group has held a series of public debates in several European capitals: the
first of these (organised in cooperation with the Warsaw-based Stefan Batory Foundation)
was held in Warsaw, in the residence of the Polish President, the second (organised in
cooperation with the Austrian Industrialists' Association) took place in Prince
Schwarzenberg's palace in Vienna, while the third and fourth were held in Paris (in
cooperation with *La République des idées* and hosted by the French Minister for Foreign
4
Affairs, Dominique de Villepin) and Berlin (hosted by his German counterpart, Joschka
Fischer).
The intellectual outcomes of the Group's meetings and the public debates

have

been presented in German in IWM's journal *Transit - Europaeische Revue*, nr. 26 and 27

(Verlag Neue Kritik, Frankfurt a.M., 2003/2004). The respective articles are also prepared

for publication in English.

Another means of bringing our ideas to the attention of a broader cross-section of

the European public are the newspaper columns written by the members of our group on

the topics under discussion. These are published in cooperation with *Project Syndicate*, a

non-commercial international group of presently 223 daily newspapers in Europe and far

beyond. 12 of these columns have appeared so far in 49 newspapers and 32 countries.

We hope the results of the Reflection Group's work can give fresh impetus to the

debate on the new union of Europe.

Krzysztof Michalski

Further details are available at: <www.iwm.at/r-reflec.htm> and <http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/social-sciences/index_en.html>.

5

On the Intellectual, Spiritual and Cultural Dimension of Europe

Concluding remarks*

1. The European Union now faces perhaps the greatest challenge in its history. It is

expanding – dramatically so – with more than 70 million people becoming eligible for new

European passports this year. Simultaneously with this expansion, the Union is attempting

to transform itself into a new type of political entity, as it radically redefines itself through

the process of drafting and ratifying a constitution.

The Union's expansion, bringing in ten new member countries, also brings into the Union

people who are often much poorer and culturally vastly different from the majority of the

citizens in the older member states. The vast majority of these new EU

citizens, many of

whom endured decades of subjugation to Communist regimes, hold thoughts and values

indelibly marked by experiences unfamiliar to long-time EU citizens. As a result, economic

and cultural differences within the Union have, at a stroke, become much greater and

more intense. The constitutional process to define the Union in a more ambitious way fuels

this intensity to an even greater degree.

Faced with **growing diversity** and the rigours of establishing a **more demanding kind of**

unity, what forces can hold the expanded, redefined European Union together? What

moral concepts, which traditions, what goals are capable of bringing together the Union's

diverse inhabitants in a democratic structure, and so underpin and anchor the European

constitution?

To examine these questions Romano Prodi, the President of the European Commission,

appointed academics and politicians from a number of Union member countries to reflect

on the intellectual and cultural dimension of an EU in the process of enlargement - in

particular to consider the relevance of this dimension to the cohesion of the expanded and

redefined Union.

2. Hitherto the Union has been enormously successful. It established durable bonds

which made a European civil war virtually impossible. The Union established a zone of

peace founded on **freedom, the rule of law**, and **social justice**. Within its member states

the Union speeded the task of overcoming the economic consequences of the Second

World War, promoting reconstruction and, later, unprecedented affluence across Europe.

* These remarks do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission.

6
Economic integration and the gradual abolition of national economies led the way to this
peaceful order. After the First World War, the French army occupied the Ruhr in order to
prevent a revival of German heavy industry. After the Second World War, the French and
the Germans decided to integrate their coal and steel industries. In doing so they laid the
foundation stone for a lasting European peace.

3. A strong political will in the six founding states was needed both to make this
development possible and to sustain it. Such a will was possible because of several
factors that encouraged integration: the profound and widespread **shock of the Second World War**; the mounting **threat posed by the Soviet Union,** and the **economic dynamism** released by the founding of the Union's precursor, the European Economic
Community (EEC), and further enhanced by the integration of national economies.

4. As memories of the Second World War faded and the risk of conflict between the
Atlantic Alliance and the Soviet Union receded, the transformation of the EEC into the
European Community, and finally into the European Union, pushed the Union's economic
goals ever more to the fore. Economic growth, improvement in living standards, extending
and enhancing systems of social protection, and rounding off the common market
assumed a priority.

But given the growing number of member states, economic and social differences
expanded – as did the expectations of EU citizens. Over time, it became increasingly
evident that economic integration – no matter how important it and its political
consequences may be – is incapable of substituting for the political forces

that originally
propelled European integration and cohesion.
This is why the aims formulated a few years ago by the Lisbon Council –
to make Europe
the most competitive economic region in the world by 2010, to establish
the labour
participation rate of 70%, and to bring about lasting growth, affluence,
and social justice –
have effectively disappeared from public consciousness. Not only have
these goals been
overtaken by events; they also do nothing to bring Europeans any closer
together. They do
not and cannot establish the internal cohesion that is necessary for the
European Union;
nor, indeed, can economic forces alone provide cohesion for any political
identity. To
function as a viable and vital polity, the European Union needs a firmer
foundation.
It is no coincidence that economic integration is not enough to drive
European political
reform. Economic integration simply does not, of itself, lead to political
integration because
`markets cannot produce a politically resilient solidarity`.
Solidarity – a genuine sense
of civic community – is vital because the competition that dominates the
marketplace gives
rise to powerful centrifugal forces. Markets may create the economic
basis of a polity and
are thereby an indispensable condition of its political constitution. But
they cannot on their
own produce political integration and provide a constitutive infrastructure
for the Union.
The original expectation, that the political unity of the EU would be a
consequence of the
European common market has proven to be illusory.
7
Indeed, the current debate over the reform of the Union's Growth and
Stability Pact shows
once again that economic integration, symbolised by the launching of the
euro, can only

continue as a basis of Europe's peaceful order if it is followed by a deeper political

integration within the Union. A currency union means a common economic policy. But

when the forces of cohesion based on shared economic successes wane or are

overshadowed by internal competition, a common economic policy requires political

integration, i.e. a level of internal cohesion that remains effective even when economic

interests diverge.

So Europe's political union demands **political cohesion**, a politically grounded community

bound by the ties of solidarity. Both the future of the Union and the dimensions of its

political integration will be decided by whether these political forces of cohesion exist and

whether they prove to be adequate in times of crisis.

5. Recognising this, the countries of the European Union deliberately set out on the path of

political integration. The Union's constitutional process expresses this decision. But how

much political integration is necessary and how politically potent should the Union

become? **To what end** does the Union need far-reaching **freedom of political action**?

5.1. First, because an economic order never evolves in a value-free environment. It needs

a legal framework and protection, the development of necessary institutions and the

establishment and enforcement by the state of the standards and duties forged and

agreed among the people. An effective and just economic order must also be embedded in

the morals, customs, and expectations of human beings, as well as in their social

institutions. So the manner in which the larger European economic area – the common

market – is in harmony with the values of European citizens, as varied as these may be, is

no mere academic problem; it is a fundamental and political one. The constant need to
make Europe's political expression reflect the values of Europe's citizens is as significant
as the functioning of the common market itself.

5.2. Second, this task, the full extent of which became evident with the completion of the
common market, requires political institutions with legislative, administrative, and judicial
functions. Only by developing such institutions (for example, a structure of economic
governance that can manage the currency union) and assuring their political legitimacy,
can a viable and vital political entity be created. The Union's constitutional process and the
subsequent adoption of the European constitutional treaty will, it is expected, provide a
lasting legitimacy for the institutional framework of a politically constituted Europe. The
constitutional treaty is intended to define the Union's political unity.

5.3. Third, the Union also needs freedom of political action because it confronts a myriad
of new tasks:
- overcoming the consequences of Europe's aging population;
- managing, both politically and legally, the desire of people from around the globe to
immigrate into the Union;

8

- dealing with the increasing inequality that is the direct result of increased immigration as
well as the Union's expansion;
- preserving peace in a globalised world.

6. So where are the forces of cohesion for the new political Union to be found if the
common interests produced by economic integration are no longer sufficient? We believe
that the older forces that animated European unification are no longer sufficiently powerful
to provide genuine political cohesion, and that, therefore, **new sources of energy must**

be looked for and found in Europe's common culture.
This does not, of course, mean that the powers which have served until now will play no
role in the future. But what has changed today is the **relative significance** of the existing
forces of cohesion, and their relative contribution to the future unity of Europe. As the old
forces of integration – desire for peace, external threats, and economic growth – are losing
their effectiveness, the role of Europe's common culture – the spiritual factor of European
integration – will inevitably grow in importance as a source of unity and cohesion.
At the same time the meaning of European culture needs to be better understood and
made politically effective. A mere list of common European values is not enough to serve
as the basis of European unity, even if the charter of basic rights included in the Union's
constitutional treaty points in this direction. This is so because every attempt to codify
"European values" is inevitably confronted by a variety of diverging national, regional,
ethnic, sectarian, and social understandings. This diversity of interpretation cannot be
eliminated by a constitutional treaty, even if backed up by legislation and judicial
interpretation.
Still, despite such difficulties of definition, there can be no doubt that there exists a
common European cultural space: a variety of traditions, ideals, and aspirations, often
intertwined and at the same time in tension with one another. These traditions, ideals, and
aspirations bring us together in a shared context and make us "Europeans": citizens and
peoples capable of a political unity and a constitution that we all recognise and experience
as "European".
The common European cultural space cannot be firmly defined and

delimited; its borders

are necessarily open, not because of our ignorance, but in principle —
because European

culture, indeed Europe itself, is not a "fact". **It is a task and a
process**.

What is European culture? What is Europe? These are questions that must
be constantly

posed anew. So long as Europe is of the present, and not simply the past,
they can never

be conclusively answered. Europe's identity is something that must be
negotiated by its

peoples and institutions. Europeans can and must adapt themselves and
their institutions,

so that European values, traditions, and conceptions of life can live on
and be effective. At

the same time, the Union and its citizens must make their values endure
as a basis of a

common identity through ever-changing conditions.

9

Europe and its cultural identity thus depend on a constant confrontation
with the new, the

different, the foreign. Hence the question of European identity will be
answered in part by

its immigration laws, and in part by the negotiated accession terms of
new members.

Neither of these – either the immigration laws or the terms of accession –
can be

determined a priori on the basis of fixed, static definitions, such as a
catalogue of

"European values".

7. If Europe is not a fact, but a task, neither can there be any fixed, once
and for all

defined European boundaries, be they internal or external. Europe's
boundaries too must

always be renegotiated. It is not geographical or national borders, then,
that define the

European cultural space – it is rather the latter which defines the
European geographical

space, a space that is in principle open.

This also means that the common **European cultural space cannot** be

defined **in
opposition to national cultures**. Polish farmers and British workers should not see
"European culture" as something foreign or even threatening. For the same reason
European culture **cannot** be defined **in opposition to a particular religion** (such as
Islam). What constitutes the content of "European culture" is not a philosophical question
that can be answered a priori; nor is it a merely historical question. It is a question that
calls for political decisions which attempt to demonstrate the significance of tradition in the
face of future tasks that Europe's Union must address.

8. European culture, that open space which must be forever redefined, does not, of itself,
establish European unity. That unity also requires a political dimension and the decisions
that it engenders. But the common European culture is what gives politics the opportunity
to make Europe into a unified political entity.

The unity of Europe is **not**, however, **only a political task**. Politics can create only the
basic conditions for European unification. Europe itself is far more than a political
construct. It is a complex – a "culture" - of institutions, ideas and expectations, habits and
feelings, moods, memories and prospects that form a "glue" binding Europeans together –
and all these are a foundation on which a political construction must rest. This complex –
we can speak of it as **European civil society** – is at the heart of political identity. It defines
the conditions of successful European politics, and also the limits of state and political
intervention.

In order to foster the cohesion necessary for political unity, European politics must thus
support the emergence and development of a civil society in Europe. It is through these

institutions of civil society that our common European culture can become a reality. But
this also means that politics and state institutions must be ready to recognize their limits.
This self-limitation implies that the political culture of Europe must be compatible with the
sense of community rooted in a common European culture. To lay claim to a common
European culture and history as the basis of political identity, European political institutions

10

must live up to the expectations engendered by the European cultural tradition. In
particular, the exercise of political power must be based on a persuasive and transparent
political leadership, rather than express itself as bureaucratic action of questionable
legitimacy. Decentralisation of public discussion and the processes of decision-making is
especially important. Indeed, only decentralisation can do justice to the cultural variety and
the wealth of forms of social organisation that make up the European civil society.

9. If the countries of Europe are to grow together into a viable political union, the people of
Europe must be prepared for a **European solidarity**. This solidarity must be stronger than
the universal solidarity which binds (or should bind) all human beings together and
underlies the idea of humanitarian aid.
European solidarity – the readiness to open one's wallet and to commit one's life to others
because they, too, are Europeans – is not something that can be imposed from above. It
must be more than **institutional solidarity**. It must be felt by Europeans as individuals.
When **individual solidarity** is not there, institutionally-based solidarity is not enough to
bring a polity into being.
The intellectual, economic, and political tendencies of recent decades -

not least the
advance of individualism - have led to an erosion of many forms of social solidarity. The
crisis of the welfare state may be understood as a consequence of this development. This
erosion may also be felt in the context of the recent European enlargement: it is reflected
in the diminished willingness – in comparison with earlier expansions – among the citizens
of older member countries to lend a hand, economically and politically, to the newcomers.
Strengthening of pan-European solidarity is one of the most important long-term tasks of
European politics. In trying to accomplish this task, we should not labour under the illusion
that the need for solidarity can be satisfied by institutional measures alone. Rather, all
institutional measures must be sustained by the readiness of the population to manifest
their own spirit of solidarity. It is thus important to give solidarity an active and prospective,
rather than passive and retrospective, dimension: we must define it in terms of the new
common tasks that Europe must address – rather than with respect to past achievements
in sharing our wealth with the existing members of the Union.
10. A particular challenge for European solidarity arises from the expansion of the Union to
countries previously forming part of the Soviet empire. How we deal with this challenge will
be decisive for the future of Europe.
How will this expansion alter the conditions of European solidarity? What do the new
members bring to the common table? Will they, as many fear, be mainly spoilers, and will
they - traumatised by totalitarianism and lacking a strong Enlightenment tradition – slow
down, or even bring to a halt, the process of the Union's democratisation? Will they,
because of their historically and strategically determined closeness to the

United States,
11
frustrate Europe's aspirations to a common foreign policy? Or will the new members not
only expose the Union to new dangers, but also open up new opportunities?
The year 1989 ushered Europe into a new age. It did not just make possible the
enlargement of Europe to the former Communist East. It also enriched Europe. That is
why the new members, despite their economic weakness, should be taken in as equal
partners in the Union. They should be able to shape the new union together with the old
members. But we must look also for other links, for the European face of their traditions
and experiences.
That the European Union was given, in 1989, a historic opportunity of rebirth was in large
part due to the revolutionary uprisings of people in the Communist-ruled Eastern Europe.
The East European revolutions were proof of the strength of the **solidarity of a civil**
society. They are the best evidence that true political realism must take the existence of
these bonds into account – and not only the interests writ in stone and mortar of political
institutions.
11. In the search for the forces capable of establishing cohesion and identity in the
European Union, the question of the **public role of European religions** is particularly
important.
Over the last few centuries, European democratic societies, learning from tragic
experience, have attempted to remove religion from the political sphere. Religion was
considered, with good reason, to be divisive, not conciliatory. That may still be the case
today. But Europe's religions also have a potential to bring people in

Europe together,
instead of separating them.
We believe that the presence of religion in the public sphere cannot be reduced to the
public role of the churches or to the societal relevance of explicitly religious views.
Religions have long been an inseparable component of the various cultures of Europe.
They are active "under the surface" of the political and state institutions; they also have an
effect on society and individuals. The result is a new wealth of forms of religion entwined
with cultural meanings.
Even in Europe, where modernisation and secularisation appear to go hand in hand,
public life without religion is inconceivable. The community-fostering power of Europe's
religious faiths should be supported and deployed on behalf of the cohesion of the new
Europe. The risks involved, however, should not be overlooked. These include a possible
invasion of the public sphere by religious institutions, as well as the threat that religion may
be used to justify ethnic conflicts. It must be remembered that many apparent religious
conflicts have political or social causes, and that they may be solved by social measures
before they become religiously charged.
The questions concerning the public role of religion in Europe resurfaced recently because
of the Balkan wars, the Muslim immigration into Europe, and (so far less dramatically) the
12
prospect of Turkey's becoming an EU member. The question of the **political relevance of
Islam** comes to the forefront in this connection.
It is, to be sure, hard to deny that the increasing presence of the various forms of Islam in
Europe's public space poses both new opportunities and new dangers for European

integration. It potentially calls into question the prevailing current ideas about Europe's

public space. Among European Moslems as well, there is a tendency to detach their

religion from the specific cultural and social context of their homelands, and this may have

potentially dangerous consequences. But the only feasible path toward a solution of the

problems posed by Islam in Europe consists in understanding the consequences of

transplanting Islam into a European context, not in a frontal confrontation between the

abstractions of "Christian Europe" and "Islam".

12. What is the impact of the intellectual and cultural meaning of Europe on **Europe's role**

in the world? To the extent that Europe acknowledges the values inherent in the rules

that constitute the European identity, those very same values will make it impossible for

Europeans not to acknowledge the duty of solidarity toward non-Europeans. This globally

defined solidarity imposes on Europe an obligation to contribute, in accordance with its

ability, to the securing of world peace and the fight against poverty. But despite this global

calling, there can be no justification for attempting to impose, perhaps with the help of the

institutions of a common European foreign and defence policy, any specific catalogue of

values on other peoples.

The fundamental dilemma of European foreign policy is the tension between the logic of

peace and the logic of cohesion. Europe sees itself as both a **zone of peace** and **a**

community of values. This dilemma cannot be solved a priori. There is no essence of

Europe, no fixed list of European values. There is no "finality" to the process of European

integration.

Europe is a project of the future. With every decision, not only its zone of

peace, its

institutions, its political, economic and social order, but also its very identity and selfdetermination

are opened for questioning and debate. In principle this has been the case throughout Europe's history. Europe's capacity for constant change and renewal was and

remains the most important source of its success and its unique character. This source

must always be recognised anew and given an institutional form: through European

politics, through civil society, and through the force of European culture. In the end, it all

comes to this: we must sustain and use our European heritage, and not allow it to perish.

October 2004

13

Members

Kurt Biedenkopf

Prime Minister of Saxony (1990-2002); former President of the German Bundesrat;

recently published: *Einheit und Erneuerung; Deutschland nach dem Umbruch in Europa*

(1994); *Offene Grenze – Offener Markt* (1990), *Zeitsignale. Parteienlandschaft im*

Umbruch (1989).

Silvio Ferrari

Professor of Church and State Relations, Università degli Studi di Milano; member of the

Comitato Nazionale di Bioetica, an advisory body to the Italian Prime Minister; member of

the Board of Directors of the International Academy for Freedom of Religion and Belief,

Washington; recently published: *Lo spirito dei diritti religiosi. Ebraismo, cristianesimo e*

islam a confronto (2002), *Diritto e religione in Europa occidentale* (with I. C. Iban 1997).

Bronislaw Geremek

Professor of European Civilization, College of Europe, Natolin; former Professor at the

College de France, a founder of "Solidarity" (Independent Self-Governing

Trade Union)

and chief advisor to its leader, Lech Walesa; former Polish Minister for Foreign Affairs;

laureate of the *Karl preis* of Aachen; Former Chair of OSCE; his publications include:

Poverty–A History (1994), *Passions Communes* (1993), *La Democrazia in Europa* (with R.

Dahrendorf and F. Furet 1993*).*

Arpad Göncz

Writer and translator of over a hundred works mostly by English and American writers;

President of Hungary (1990-2000); Laureate of the Wheatland Prize and of the Premio

Mediterraneo; former President of the Federation of Hungarian Writers.

John Gray

Professor of European Thought, London School of Economics; member of the IWM

Academic Advisory Board; author of *Al Qaeda and What It Means To Be Modern* (2003),

Straw Dogs: Thoughts on Humans and Other Animals (2002), *Two Faces of Liberalism*

(2000), *False Dawn: The Delusions of Global Capitalism* (1998), *Voltaire and*

Enlightenment (1998).

Will Hutton

Chief Executive of The Work Foundation; former editor-in-chief of *The Observer* and

Director of Guardian National Newspapers; former economics editor of *The Guardian*;

former editor-in-chief of the European Business Channel; author of *The World We're In*

(2002) and *The State We're In* (1995*).*

14

Jutta Limbach

President of the Goethe Institute; former President of the German Constitutional Court;

Professor of Law; recently published: *Das Bundesverfassungsgericht* (2001) and *Im*

Namen des Volkes - Macht und Verantwortung der Richter (1999).

Krzysztof Michalski

Professor of Philosophy at the University of Warsaw and at Boston University; rector of the
Institute for Human Sciences in Vienna (IWM); editor of *Transit Europäische Revue.*

Ioannis Petrou

Professor of Sociology and Social Ethics at Aristotle University, Thessaloniki; recently
published: *After the Militant, the Volunteer Beyond the Secularization. European Identity,*
Welfare State, Religions (with A. Nesti, 2002); forthcoming is his *Multiculturality and*
Religious Freedom: Essays about the Multicultural Society, Religious Freedom and
Democracy, Racism, Fundamentalism, and Others.

Alberto Quadrio Curzio

Professor of Economics and Dean of the Faculty of Political Sciences, Università Cattolica,
Milano; Member of the Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei; Vice President of Istituto
Lombardo Accademia di Scienze e Lettere; President of Società Italiana degli Economisti
(1995-1998); author of about 300 scientific publications both in Italian and in English.

Michel Rocard

Member of the European Parliament; Chairman of the Committee on Culture, Youth,
Education, the Media and Sport; Member of the Delegation for Relations with the United
States; Prime Minister of France (1988-1991); his publications include: *Pour une autre*
Afrique (2002), *Entretien* (2001), *Mutualité et droit communautaire* (1999), *La nation,*
L'Europe, le monde (in collab., 1997), *L'art de la paix - L'Edit de Nantes* (1997).

Simone Veil

Member of the French Constitutional Council; President of the Foundation for the Memory
of the Shoah; President of the European Parliament (1979-1982); former president of the
European Parliament's Legal Affairs Committee; former French Minister for

Health and
Social Affairs.
Giulia Amaducci (organiser)
European Commission, DG Research
Jean-Claude Eeckhout
European Commission, Special Adviser of President Prodi
Sandro Gozi (organiser)
European Commission, Political Assistant of President Prodi
15
Calendar
Meetings
Brussels, 29 January 2003
Launch meeting
Brussels, 5 May 2003
Conditions of European Solidarity
Brussels, 21 May 2003
The Role of Religion in European Integration
Public debates
Warsaw, 29 May 2003
The Borders of Europe
Vienna, 10 -11 October 2003
After the Enlargement
Paris, 9-10 January 2004
Islam and Europe
Berlin, 3 March 2004
Europe´s Responsibility in the World of Today
16
Commentaries
by members and experts of the Reflection Group published in European
newspapers in
collaboration with *Project Syndicate*
Kurt Biedenkopf
Making Culture Count
Silvio Ferrari
The Secular and the Sacred in Europe's Constitution
Bronislaw Geremek
The Two Communities of Europe
Nilüfer Göle
The Islamist Identity
Jutta Limbach

Making Culture Count

by Kurt Biedenkopf

Constitutions express a political community's history, culture, values, and political convictions. The
Constitution for Europe now being written is no different. It cannot create the common bonds that
define Europe and hold it together. It can only reflect and be animated by them.

Today, however, the cohesive forces that held Europe together for two generations have lost some
(if not all) of their strength. Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, peace and liberty are more or less
taken for granted. Economic integration has advanced so far that a return to the national rivalries
that twice led the continent into suicidal warfare is unthinkable.

The postwar search for affluence, too, has lost much of its allure. In Germany and other member
states, economic growth no longer seems certain. Citizens are increasingly wary of the idea of
economic and social progress. Public debate instead highlights the need for restricting government
activities and reducing social transfers.

Enlargement of the European Union from 15 to 25 members will mean that for decades Europeans

will need to live with greater material inequalities. To be sure, lower standards of living having

always existed between Europe's east and west. During Europe's Cold War division, that gap

widened considerably. With enlargement, those differences can no longer be hidden.

German reunification provides a sobering example in dealing with this problem. If the enlarged EU

were to attempt on a Europe-wide scale what Germany did for its eastern lands, current EU

members would need to transfer roughly 4% of their combined GDP to the new member states for at

least a decade. Politics will make such transfers impossible, but even if that were not the case, the

new members lack the political, economic, social, and administrative infrastructure to absorb them.

Thus, the time needed to narrow the gap between Europe's east and west will be measured in

generations, not years.

If the ties that have bound Europe together for two generations are fraying, what alternative bonds

can be found? Late in his life Jean Monnet said that, were he to begin European integration again,

he would start with culture. But secularization, rationalization, and atomization of civil and social life,

and the steady expansion of government into every social sphere, have lead to a privatization of

culture and religion, reducing their potential to stimulate feelings of community, identity, and

solidarity.

If the EU is to be durable, it must place greater emphasis on its cultural heritage. Because of

Europe's multiplicity of languages, no one language can serve as a strong element of identity. Of

18

course, English is developing into a lingua franca. But as a lingua franca it is limited to serving as a

technical or professional language, not the language of a community.

When it comes to real cultural identity, Europe's true "common language" is composed of its

musical, literary, artistic, and architectural traditions-the cultural substance perceived by all as

European. The cultivation, constant renewal, development, and protection of this cultural identity

must be a key common European task.

This common cultural substance is the foundation on which European nations and states are built.

Yet it is not produced by state action. The state can support its development, preservation, and

renewal, but cannot compel its existence. People primarily determine the extent to which culture

flourishes. So cultural cohesion in Europe will have to grow from the bottom up.

But European individuals and civil societies find it hard to assert their autonomy in the face of the

state. The great European experiment will succeed only if Europe's citizens limit the scope of the

state's claims on society and its resources, thus redefining those areas of self-government and

autonomy where responsible community life and cultural activities flourish. It is in these areas,

however, that the constitutional drafts emerging in Brussels are wanting.

Consider the EU's Charter of Fundamental Rights. Rather than limiting itself to basic human rights,

the Charter dilutes them by engaging in detailed regulation of labor standards, social laws, and

pronouncements that reflect industrial-age experience rather than address the future. To promote

such "rights" as fundamental will more likely perpetuate the status quo than help shape Europe's

future.

In this sense, the Charter is reactionary: if it is included in the constitution, it will impede the

development of rights and responsibilities appropriate to the future.

Europe's new constitution will be accepted as a guarantee of freedom and lawful government only if

it results from a broad public dialogue reflecting the common cultural and moral assumptions that

bind Europeans together. If it is to last, it will not be enough for it to be conceived in the light only of

today's experience. If the Constitution is to guide Europeans through periods of change and yet
unknown threats, its roots must reach the foundations of European history and identity as they are
embodied in the shared culture that Europe's citizens freely acknowledge as their own.

Kurt Biedenkopf, a leader of Germany's Christian Democrats, was Prime Minister of Saxony.

© Project Syndicate / Institute for Human Sciences 2003

19

The Secular and Sacred in Europe's Constitution

by Silvio Ferrari

Europe's churches may be empty, but religion still incites heated debate about its place in Europe's
constitution. To meet the demands that some explicit reference to Europe's Christian heritage be
made in the constitution, Valérie Giscard D'Estaing, the chairman of the constitutional convention,
has pondered adding such a reference in the constitution's preamble - a difficult compromise to
make, perhaps, for the former French president given the secular nature of the French constitution.

Others want Europe to affirm its secular nature. What role should the secular and the sacred play in
shaping the European Constitution?

A few weeks ago the European Convention approved Article 37 of the future European Constitution.

Taken together with Article 10 of Europe's Charter of Fundamental Rights, these two articles define
the Church-State system that will govern the European Union.

Unsurprisingly, religious freedom is given prominence. Every European citizen has the right to
practice the religion of his or her choice, to adopt another religion, or to practice no religion.

Underlying this notion is the paramount position of individual conscience, which carries with it the
right of every person to make decisions on religious matters that conform to his or her conscience,
without that choice inciting any negative legal consequences. Whether Catholic, Protestant, or

Orthodox - whether believer or atheist - civil and political rights must be equally apportioned

regardless of a citizen's choice of religion or conscience.

The second guiding principle concerns the autonomy of religious communities. The EU recognises

the "identity and specific contribution" of churches to European life. That language is, of course, a

little vague, but it means that religious communities have characteristics which make them different

from other associations and institutions and that Europe is prepared to respect these distinctions.

The third principle established by Article 37 is that a "regular dialogue" will be maintained between

the Union and Europe's religious communities (as well as philosophical and non-confessional

organisations). Separation of Church and State does not mean mutual ignorance. The common

good benefits more from open, transparent dialogue than by the Union turning a deaf ear to religion -

that is, provided that the borders between religion and politics are clearly defined. The "laïcité" of the

State - fundamental in most European governments - does not require that Churches be isolated in

a political ghetto.

Finally, the boundaries of religious autonomy and the ways that States co-operate with Churches are

matters that should primarily be framed in law by Europe's member states. The EU undertakes to

20

respect and not prejudice "the status under national law of churches and religious associations or

communities in the Member States."

This means that the EU will not interfere with the national systems of Church-State relations that

now exist, and will refrain from imposing a common model of church/state relations. Poland and Italy

can maintain their concordats with the Catholic Church; France will not be compelled to abandon its

century-long separation of Church and State; Queen Elizabeth II can continue to head the Church of

England. Defining the Church-State system and its principal features is a right of the citizens of each
EU member state.
In essence, Article 10 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights and Article 37 of the draft Constitution
constitute a coherent model, reflecting characteristics that are largely part of a common European
heritage – religious liberty, autonomy of religious communities, cooperation between Church and
State, while respecting the specific differences that exist in various member states.
Of course, improvements are possible. Equal treatment of religious communities is not mentioned in
the text prepared by the European Convention. Although granting equal treatment is primarily a task
of EU states, omitting this principle from the Constitution endangers not only the principle of equality
but that of religious liberty as well. If there is no equality, religious liberty is at risk. Moreover, the
nature of Church-State co-operation could, perhaps, be defined more explicitly by drawing clear
distinctions between what constitutes the spiritual and the secular. Regular dialogue with religious
communities, though a good thing, should not be extended to purely secular areas.
It is here that efforts to include a reference to Europe's Judeo-Christian heritage in the preamble of
the Constitution must be considered dispassionately. Of course, European civilization arises from a
synthesis of religious and humanistic values. That Judeo-Christian heritage, the legacies of Greece
and Rome, even the principles of the Enlightenment: all are at the root of the way many Europeans
regard their lives, although a long process of secularisation has made it more difficult to discern this
relationship.
But mentioning a specific religious tradition in Europe's Constitution is dubious. Such a mention
would be largely symbolic and, although symbols are important and help to foster unity, they are

dangerous when they exclude and divide. A considerable part of the European Muslim community

might feel excluded if such a reference were included in the future European Constitution, which will

also be their Constitution. This feeling could be exploited by groups that want to prevent the

development of a moderate, modern European Islam, and would be a bonanza for radical

fundamentalist Muslims.

Silvio Ferrari is Professor of Church and State Relations, Università degli Studi di Milano.

© Project Syndicate/Institute for Human Sciences May 2003

21

The Two Communities of Europe

by Bronislaw Geremek

Europe finds itself at a paradoxical turning point. While legal harmonization and constitution- making

attest to deepening integration, Europe's institutions have failed to generate what every political

community needs in order to survive and thrive: a feeling of belonging. As long as this is true,

integration cannot succeed. Quite simply, if the European Union is to overcome national

parochialism and embrace a shared and binding purpose, it must abandon the rhetoric of

accountants and speak in a language that comprehends what is good and bad, beautiful and ugly,

right and wrong.

This won't happen automatically or overnight. Communal values and bonds evolve from a long

accumulation of experience, with mythological and historical understandings that give this

experience the appearance of having evolved organically. There is nothing comparable in EU

integration, which seems far more like a deliberate choice by an imperial few. So it is difficult to see

how this path could lead to the collective and individual identity that European unification requires.

Instead, Europe should draw on two periods of community building. Medieval Christianity in its 13thcentury

formed a community united around a common faith, with Rome as its unifying power center.

Saint Peter's successors as Roman pontiffs oversaw a network of Church-run universities which

educated cultural elites in the same way and in the same language (Latin). A network of churches-—

built in the same style throughout Europe—shared a common calendar and liturgy. Medieval

Christianity was by nature European, although it avoided the word itself and accepted all national

forms of cultural expression.

The "Republic of Letters," lasting from Erasmus until the Enlightenment, represents Europe's second

community. As vernacular languages—particularly French—displaced Latin, religious discourse

gave way to observation and analysis, with unlimited faith in reason and scientific progress. A

communicat-ions network that allowed rapid dissemination of ideas served a common spirit.

Intellectual and cultural ties were reinforced by travel, so that statements such as Montesquieu's—

that "Europe is just one nation made up of many"—flowed naturally.

The emergence of both communities—albeit in pursuit of opposite ends—forms the key reference

point for a European identity. The German philosopher Karl Jaspers once said that European liberty

was founded on the antitheses of "the secular world and transcendence, science and faith, material

technology and religion." So the EU should not be afraid to affirm both medieval Christianity's

community of faith and the modern era's community of reason. Only this will do justice to the contra22

dictory essence of the European spirit.

But by this standard, the preamble of the draft European Constitution drawn up by the Convention is

utterly inadequate. Initially, the Convention refused to include any mention of Christianity or Europe's

Judeo-Christian heritage whatsoever, citing only the Enlightenment tradition, alongside the Greeks

and Romans. Although a compromise solution was provisionally accepted,

its message is weak and
obscure.

A pity. To be sure, Europe has paid a heavy and painful price for its religious rifts, and these feuds
must not be rekindled. But the Constitution must not only introduce more clarity, transparency, and
efficiency into the workings of European institutions; it must also bring the EU closer to its citizens.

This calls for a bit of "European metaphysics." EU leaders should talk about the European idea and
the European spirit in a way that encourages Europe's citizens to think about how they came
together, why they are staying together, and what they want to do together.

The answer seems to revolve around the central place that European civilisation has given the
human person since mixing barbarian customs with Christianity. This anthropocentric vision is
carried by the Christian tradition in the message that man is made in the image of God and that the
Son of God sacrificed himself for man. But we also find it in the Enlightenment tradition, which
declares that man is the measure of all things or that he is vested with grandeur and dignity.

The dual foundation of European thought makes it possible to transcend the conflict between
religion and secularism that accompanied the recent debate on the ideological bases of the
constitution. By taking the model of a civilisation that puts man and his dignity in a central position, it
can also be the starting point for a genuine discussion on the future of Europe.

The danger here is that "community values" might become a partition that generates attitudes and
policies of exclusion. On the contrary, the concept of human dignity must encourage a radical
opening towards others. Europe owes it to itself to be pluralist, aware of its cultural debt to the
Greeks and Romans, the Arabs and the Jews, learning from its own experience the power of

tolerance and the poverty and shame of closed, totalitarian ideologies.

In fact, human rights must define the very image of Europe; it must be its emblem or even its

"religion." Human rights should be the ideological benchmark for Europe's internal politics and

foreign policy—otherwise, the creation of the post of EU foreign affairs minister will remain a dead

letter. Europe should base the multilateralism of its foreign policy on human rights, while working on

reforming inter-national law and the UN system to ensure that human rights win out over shortsighted

political calculations.

23

But most importantly, European integration must not only define institutions and policies, but it must

also galvanise ideas. The role of the intellectual debate on the future of Europe is to strengthen

European solidarity, to produce ideas and visions that are powerful enough to show realistically what

direction to take, and to mobilise the imagination to build a powerful, courageous, and lucid

community.

Bronislaw Geremek, a historian and one of the main advisers to the Solidarity movement before

1989, was Poland's Foreign Minister between 1997-2000.

© Project Syndicate/Institute for Human Sciences, September 2003.

24

The Islamist Identity

by Nilüfer Göle

Everywhere you look nowadays, Islam is used (and misused) as a political force. Some Muslims use

it as a call to action; many in the West (and elsewhere) perceive Islam as an "other" demanding

contain-ment and exclusion. As a Turk, I feel both sides of this debate directly. The reason that

Islam seems like a religion of the "other" to Western eyes is that the West has wit-nessed a

systematic de-institutionalization of religion. It is not religion that disappeared from modern Western

life, of course, but the claims that religious institutions can make on

individual behavior. Religion in

the modern world is a much more personal and spiritual experience than ever before.

Yet a process of de-institutionalization of religious experience is also taking place within Islam.

Politicization of Islam is displacing the authority of Islam's religious classes, the ulema. As in the

West, Islamic religious experience is becoming more personal. Interpretation of religious texts by

individual Muslims, including political militants, intellectuals and women, is one result of this. Another

is the vulgarization of religious knowledge, with the Koran's teachings abused and taken out of

context to support political ends.

Who now decides what is legitimate and what is illicit in Islam? Who has the authority to interpret

religious texts? Who can issue a "fatwa" or declare "jihad"? Nowadays, activism and terrorism

provide, or rather impose, a new source for legitimacy. So lay people speak of what Islam does and

does not mean, despite lacking the institutional authority of religious schools and training.

Indeed, Islam today is primarily interpreted through political agents and cultural movements, not

religious institutions. This de-institutionalization has enabled Islam to move from being a local and

national social bond to forging imaginary bonds between all Muslims, everywhere, who feel themselves

socially uprooted. Thus Islamism can unite adherents who previously were deeply divided:

spiritual Sufi and canonized Shariat Islam; Shia and Sunni Islam; conservative Saudi Arabia and

revolutionary Iran.

At the same time, Islam is on the move, its believers leaving rural areas for urban ones and, through

migration, to the cities of the West. Many see this movement as something negative, emphasizing

the fact that these people are socially uprooted, which leads to alienation and, for some, to terrorism.

But social mobility is also a precondition for creating a modern outlook.

Of course, through migration Muslims experience a sense of distancing from their social origins, if
not an outright break with them. This is true for migrant Muslims in Europe, but also of those recently
urbanized in Muslim countries. Consequently, their religious experience is of a new kind.
Community, religious, or state institutions do not directly hand it to them. Instead, religious
experience for them is a form of social imagination within which they reconstruct a sense of
belonging to Islam in new and strange surroundings.
Indeed, it is not distance from but proximity to modern life that triggers a return to religious identity.
Most radicalism arises in groups who, by their experience of mobility and displacement, are
acquainted with secular Western ways of political thinking and urban living. Disoriented by unfamiliar
surroundings, Islam becomes their anchor.
But for this anchor to work, Islam must be liberated from its traditionally subservient, passive and
docile posture in the face of modernity. By wearing a veil or beard, claiming the right for places to
pray at work or school, and demanding special foods, Muslims identify themselves overtly as
Muslims. They are telling everyone around them that they are more zealous and meticulous in their
religious observance than those who confine their religiosity to private life.
For example, non-Muslims usually see veiling as a sign of the debasement and inferiority of Muslim
women. From a stigma, however, it has become for Muslims a sign of their positive affirmation of an
Islamic identity.
Young Muslim women in Europe illustrate this transformation perfectly. Girls who adopt the
headscarf in French and German schools are closer in many respects (namely youth culture, fashion
conscious-ness and language) to their classmates than to their homebound, uneducated mothers. In

adopting the headscarf for Europe's public sphere, these girls are unintentionally altering the symbol
and the role of Muslim women.

This tendency extends deeper than headscarves. European, indeed all Western Muslims, possess a
sense of double belonging, a double cultural capital. They define themselves through their religiosity,
but also have gained universal, secular knowledge. Because they have a double cultural capital,
they can circulate relatively freely between different activities and spaces—home, school, youth
associat-ions, and urban leisure space.

Being a Muslim and being an Islamist are not the same thing. What we are witnessing today is a
shift from a Muslim identity to an Islamist identity. The religious self for individual Muslims is being
shifted from the private to the public realm. The question for everyone is whether that search for
identity can be satisfied with headscarves and wide public acceptance of Islamic religious practice,
or if positive affirmation of Islam demands a more fundamental renunciation of modernity.

Nilüfer Göle is Directeur d'etudes, Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, Paris.

26

Educating Europe

by Jutta Limbach

Education has played a big part in healing Europe's divisions. Four decades ago, Charles de Gaulle
and Konrad Adenauer approved the creation of new textbooks that children in both countries would
use to help heal the century-long Franco-German antagonism.

Today's challenges call for such a dynamic use of educational policy. With the May accession of the
ten central, eastern, and southern European candidate states, the European Union will be more
politically, economically, and socially diverse than ever. This entails new opportunities, no doubt, but
also new risks. Because an enlarged Union will become a reality in just two

months, it is imperative
to develop concepts for cultural understanding that contribute to the successful integration of the
new members.
Some values, long espoused by the Union, should be relatively easy to convey. A decade ago, with
the Maastricht Treaty, EU members agreed to respect the history, culture, and traditions of all of
their constituent peoples. The draft constitution that recently failed to gain acceptance in the first
round of negotiations not only promises to respect cultural heritage; it obliges the Union actively to
protect, maintain, and develop the wealth of Europe's cultural and linguistic diversity.
But Europe can succeed in this task only if its various constituent cultures do not seal themselves off
from one another. Within a mobile and open Europe, there can be no fencing off of foreign cultures;
contact cannot be avoided. Diversity has to be lived, which means establishing one's own
uniqueness and learning to cope in and with other regions and mindsets. Goethe already spoke of
this in his play "Torquato Tasso," when he cried out: "Compare yourself! Discover what you are!"
Indeed, Europeans will only succeed in building the wider Europe if they are open to what is foreign
to them. Xenophobia is a sign of education gone wrong – an expression of narrow-mindedness and
the inability to put oneself in the position of others. So, rather than embarking on a search for a
European identity, we should agree on mutual educational objectives to increase the awareness of
all Europeans of the "others" who are their brethren in Europe.
A thirst for knowledge, a delight in engaging with the world, and empathy with people from different
cultures are qualities that can ensure diversity in unity, and unity in diversity. The same is true for the
virtue of tolerance and for multilingualism. Only those who are familiar with European history and
who engage in discussion with the candidate countries about what Europe

is and should be will be

able to bridge the gap between different cultures and religions.

This implies critical faculties and the ability to tolerate criticism. Moreover, the current EU member

states will not only have to be able to tolerate the criticism by central, eastern, and southern

Europeans of western civilization, but also to take such criticism into consideration as they ponder

policy.

A successful education teaches us to treat others with dignity, regardless of religion, race, origin, or

gender. A significant element of a successful education is the willingness to be tolerant of others.

Psychologically, this virtue implies the ability to put oneself in others' position.

Communication between members of different cultures fails so often because we know too little

about one another. Travel broadens the mind, they say, but for that to happen, more is required than

merely frequent changes of location. To acquire an insight into how people from other cultures

perceive the world, what is required is knowledge of how they live and experience life.

A newer insight would be: multilingualism broadens the mind. Language is not just a means of

communication. Language is culture. The very question of which states of mind, characteristics, and

circumstances a language has words for tells us something about cultural peculiarities.

For the German language, let me point here to *Weltschmerz, Weltgeist, Zeitgeist, Schadenfreude,*

Realpolitik, or Bildung – all of them words for which other languages often lack precise equivalents.

Moreover, by learning a foreign language, one acquires a new understanding of one's own. Most

importantly, though, language provides access to the other culture. Calls for attendance in a foreign

school – if possible for at least one year – as part of a future European curriculum should be heard

and seriously considered.

Of course, multilingualism, empathy, tolerance, and the acquisition of knowledge about foreign

cultures cannot be decreed like taxes. But the state can and should organise a good ethical and

political education that affords young people the opportunity to interact with others and recognise

and accept their equality. Liberal democracy, in its search for civic-mindedness, depends on people

and institutions that can guide the way by their example, beliefs, or worldview.

Time and again throughout the course of our lives, we must bring ourselves to tolerate opinions and

behaviours that seem contrary to our own. In this effort, we are sustained only by education. The

actor and writer Peter Ustinov found a graphic image for this: "Education is important, especially

when it comes to dismantling prejudices. You can't help being a prisoner within your own mind, but

the least you can do is ensure that the cell is decently furnished."

Jutta Limbach, a former President of the German Constitutional Court, is Professor of law and

President of the Goethe Institute in Munich.

© Project Syndicate / Institute for Human Sciences, February 2004

28

Does Islam Threaten Democracy?

by Lord Bhikhu Parekh

Is Islam incompatible with multicultural democracy? Many people point to the fact that few Muslim

societies are democratic and conclude that Islam must be inherently undemocratic. They point to

Muslim rhetoric suffused with hatred of the West, and deduce that Muslims cannot be good citizens

of Western democracies.

Britain, with around 1.6 million Muslims in a population of 58.7 million, provides an excellent place to

test these notions. Three quarters of British Muslims come from the Indian subcontinent, mainly rural

Pakistan and Bangladesh. This is important because some of their difficulties in settlement arise not

from religion but from unfamiliarity with modern life.

So far, Britain has seen only four Muslim riots, compared to about eight race-related riots by Afro-

Caribbeans. One concerned Salman Rushdie's novel *The Satanic Verses*; the others were triggered

by police insensitivity and white racist marches. With the qualified exception of the first, all riots were

local, relatively minor, and lasted barely a day or two. So Britain's Muslims have presented no major

problems of law and order.

But Muslims' presence in British society has presented other challenges. One is a "clash of

practices,'' including demands for Halal meat for Muslim schoolchildren, Muslim dress, prayer time,

female circumcision, polygamy, and arranged marriages. Female circumcision and polygamy are

banned, and Muslims accept this.

Muslims also generally respect "Western values'' such as equality, freedom of expression, tolerance,

peaceful resolution of differences, and respect for majority decisions. Indeed, equality among races

is an important Muslim value and practice. Equality of the sexes poses the gravest difficulties--

particularly because Muslim girls in Britain increasingly assert it.

Similarly, after some theological debate, British Muslims have widely accepted that they owe

unreserved loyalty to Britain. However there is some ambiguity about what they should do when the

claims of the state clash with those of the *umma* (the worldwide community of Islam).

For example, Muslims objected to the 1991 war against Iraq, but did not mount public protests. The

government urged the country to respect Muslims' "understandable sympathies for their fellowreligionists,''

and tensions were avoided. A small number of young Muslims later fought with the

Taliban. But most British Muslims condemned them, insisting on loyalty to Britain. Most Muslims

also approved when the police raided and confiscated weapons at the Finsbury Park mosque in

London, whose Imam had long preached hatred of the West and support for terrorists.

29

Moreover, Muslims eagerly participate in public affairs, voting at a rate not much different from the

rest of the population. There are 150 local Muslim councillors and eight mayors, slightly fewer than

other ethnic minorities, but not alarmingly so. There are four Muslims in the House of Lords and

three in the House of Commons, more than for some other ethnic minorities.

Indeed, in formal and informal ways, Islam is increasingly interpreted in a manner that brings it

closer to the central values of British democracy. A distinctively British brand of Islam is beginning to

emerge, just as France, Germany, the Netherlands, and Spain are producing their own forms of

Islam.

"British'' Islam obviously clashes with some aspects of the Islam with which immigrants arrived. But

religion does not operate in a vacuum. Its influence is mediated by many other factors. When

Muslims find themselves living in democracies, they adjust. Political survival is one reason: when in

a minority, the option of pressing for an Islamic state, with all its undemocratic potential is closed.

Others welcome the opportunity in a democracy to pursue legitimate interests, and even to protest.

The main problem for Muslims is not democracy, but coping with a multicultural society. Muslims are

convinced of the absolute superiority of Islam, which is reflected in the constant invocation and

desperate desire to revive past glory, as well as a positive duty to convert followers of other

religions. They may marry non-Muslims, but do not allow others to marry their women, and expect

those marrying within Islam to convert to it.

This cannot be attributed to the current widespread feeling among Muslims that their identity is

under threat. Even in the self-confident Ottoman Empire, where Jews and

Christians enjoyed
considerable tolerance, followers of these religions were second-class citizens. While free to convert
to Islam, they were forbidden to convert Muslims or marry their women.
Muslim attitudes towards multiculturalism are consequently one-sided. They welcome it because it
gives them the freedom to retain their religious identity and to familiarize others with their beliefs. But
they resent it because it denies their superiority and exposes them and their children to other
religions and secular cultures.
Islam and Europe have long shaped one another's cultural identity. Each has been the other's
``other,'' and their sometimes friendly, sometimes hostile, relations have bonded them more deeply
than either realizes.
But with the exception of Spain and parts of Eastern Europe, they have until very recently interacted
at a distance and outside Europe's boundaries. They now need to find new ways of coexisting and
cultivating civic amity. Britain's experience shows that there are strong reasons for optimism.

Bhikhu Parekh is Centennial Professor at the London School of Economics, a Labour Party

member of the British House of Lords, and President of the Academy of Learned Societies in

Social Sciences.

30

Some Thoughts on Solidarity and Subsidiarity

by Alberto Quadrio Curzio

1. Premise

There are two fundamental principles underlying European construction, inscribed both in the
treaties, and in the ideals, history and praxis of the EU and EC since their beginnings as ECSC and
EEC: solidarity and subsidiarity. These two principles can be found at the crossroads of many
scientific disciplines (philosophy, politics, economics, sociology, law) and have for years been

present in the legal and institutional framework of the Union itself. They are mentioned in the

Treaties, in the Chart of Fundamental Right, (which quotes both principles in the Preamble) and in

the project of a Constitutional Treaty under construction by the European Convention. In the

following reflections, however, we shall not be considering how these principles are dealt with within

the legal and institutional framework of the EU but shall try to point out some of their fundamental

aspects – both political and value-related.

2. Solidarity

There are at least two interpretations of solidarity: one is static solidarity, which is related to the

distribution of income and wealth; the other is dynamic solidarity, related to the production of income

and wealth and their distribution. Dynamic solidarity is a broader concept than static solidarity.

In the history of the EU (a denomination that shall be used here even for periods of the EEC and

ECSC) dynamic solidarity was strongly present in the first period, both in the practice of economic

development promotion (the post-war reconstruction) and in the Treaties (the Treaty of Rome in

particular). This does not mean, however, that it was suppressed in the following years, as this

principle has always been present - the monetary union, for example, is an expression of dynamic

solidarity. Some countries did not benefit from the Euro in the short-medium term, but accepted it for

the sake of solidarity with the conviction that it would have positive effects for EU development and

growth in the long run. Dynamic solidarity, in more specific terms, means favouring economic growth

and employment, investment and innovation. However, as the rate of growth of GDP indicates,

dynamic solidarity in the European Union has been seriously undermined in the last ten years. What

is particularly worrying is the R&D (Research & Development) lag. The realisation of the Lisbon

strategy (2000), as a result of which the EU should become the most competitive world economy
founded on knowledge, has thus become one of the most important objectives for the Union.
Static solidarity in the EU is reflected in social security promotion and increased taxation for social
welfare purposes. This kind of solidarity has been growing in importance, which – in a society with a
population getting older and with rigidities in the public sector balances – has led to a slowing down
of the rate of growth of EU economy. We should therefore find out, if in the EU of today static
solidarity oriented towards old people prevails over dynamic solidarity favouring young people, if
"consumption" prevails over "investment" and if so, what will be the possible consequences. This is
one of the biggest challenges for the future of the European Union.
31

3. Subsidiarity

There are two interpretations of subsidiarity: vertical subsidiarity and horizontal subsidiarity. Both
can be interpreted as positive and negative subsidiarity. Vertical subsidiarity deals with the
distribution of powers among different levels of government and sovereignty: the EU, national states,
regions and municipalities. The best known application of this principle is federalism. In the
European Treaties we can find a clear expression of vertical subsidiarity. But is this category enough
to embrace the emerging institutional and constitutional settings of the Union?
Horizontal subsidiarity, on the other hand, deals with the responsibility and freedom of human beings
as well as social and economic powers. In other words, it has to do with the relations between state,
society and market. But society and market might have their own "rights and sovereignty" which are
not granted by the state. Thus, the problem is that of areas of autonomy. An example of horizontal
subsidiarity is the internal European market which has created a new kind

of economic freedom and

increased competition between firms that are no longer protected by national governments. In

negative terms, subsidiarity means that the state cannot violate freedom and individual responsibility

(in both society and the economic sphere), which must be respected in a maximum degree. In

positive terms it means that support must be given by a "superior power" whenever freedom and

individual responsibility do not suffice for the achievement of ends necessary for the dignity of

human beings. This support, however, should be implemented in such a way that the natural

potential of individuals, society and market is promoted.

Again, if these remarks are correct, what are the consequences for the future of the European

Union? Or, to be more precise, what should be the role of horizontal subsidiarity, which has not

received a clear treatment neither in the European Treaties, the Chart of Fundamental Rights, nor in

the work of the European Convention?

4. Solidarity and subsidiarity

These two categories are connected and the elaboration of the relationship between them is an

important task because, for instance, solidarity without subsidiarity could result in a powerful welfare

state where freedom and personal responsibility are not sufficiently promoted. In the XXI century,

Europe must realise both principles - solidarity and subsidiarity - which are also potentially capable

of overcoming traditional differences between political attitudes, which have often led to sharp

divisions between political parties in the XX century.

Alberto Quadrio Curzio is Professor of Political Economy, Dean of the Faculty of Political

Sciences and Director of the Research Centre in Economic Analysis, Universitá Cattolica

in Milano

© Project Syndicate / Institute for Human Sciences, April 2004.

32

Europe's Secular Mission
by Michel Rocard

Economics and politics have been uneasy allies in the process of European unification. From the
moment Europe's coal and steel industries were merged in an effort to prevent future wars on the
Continent, the "European project" has often relied on economic interests to propel itself forward.
Now, however, new members mostly join for political and geo-strategic reasons. This change in
motivation requires changes in how the Union thinks about itself, changes that go beyond the ideas
now circulating at the convention drawing up a constitution for the Union.
Of course, the prosperity that European unification has delivered undoubtedly lures new
members, but the EU's attraction extends far beyond pocketbook issues. For the Union is also a
huge area ruled by law: laws that concern production and commercial exchange, but also laws that
establish and protect the rights of man.
Because of this, the Union's neighbors have felt magnetically attracted to this area of peace and
prosperity. The first enlargement, in 1973, brought in Great Britain, Ireland, and Denmark and was
based mostly on economic considerations. The three countries preferred to integrate themselves
into the EU's burgeoning economic area rather than remain outside it. Since then, all successive
waves of enlargement were motivated mostly, if not exclusively, by political reasons.
Greece provides a good example. After the dictatorship of the colonels, that small country sought
international rehabilitation through membership in the European Community, which provided not
only a democratic "certificate" but also helped to consolidate the fragile Greek democracy. The
modernizing transformation now taking place in Greece owes much to the country's Union
membership.
Much the same is true for Spain and Portugal. Rejected while they were

still fascist dictatorships,

their candidacies were accepted when their regimes changed. As with Greece, democratic

consolidation was at stake. Indeed, from the economic point of view, entry into Europe, and having

to compete with the powerful economies of Germany or France, was risky, but it was a necessary

condition for securing their democracies.

The inclusion of the next three next countries - Sweden, Finland, and Austria - posed lesser

economic problems. They sought membership mostly for geostrategic reasons: to consolidate their

security. Neutrality prevented them from becoming candidacies so long as the Soviet Union existed.

Once the Soviet Union's demise made it possible, they joined.

The motivation of the candidates who will join in 2004 is analogous. Only Malta is a case in which

33

the major interest in membership - access to the great common market - is economic. For Cyprus,

membership is, above all, a means to unblock the stalemate between the island's Turkish and

Cypriot communities. As for the eight countries recently freed from Soviet domination, their priority

is democratic consolidation. The three Baltic states and Slovenia also want to entrench their recently

revived national identities.

To be sure, the Union's potential to induce economic dynamism, best seen in Ireland and Greece,

attracts new members. But the Iraq crisis provided East European countries with an opportunity to

confirm the absolute priority they place on strategic stability, which is why they put relations with the

US ahead of worries about European political solidarity.

So the following question arises. Although it is logical that all Europeans want to give a strong

institutional basis to Europe's definitive and everlasting peace, and that we pragmatically unite our

markets, these imperatives are insufficient to energize a Union with 25 members. A deeper shared

purpose is needed.

Right now, Europe has set its sight on political bonds that will be, for some time, impossible to

establish. Our twenty five nations have profoundly different historical experiences, geographical

situations, and strategic sensibilities. So today's most hyped goal - conceiving and putting into

practice a common foreign policy - seems too ambitious to succeed. One can bemoan this, but it is

better to accommodate oneself to this fact and accept the notion that it will take decades for Europe

to think in the same way on most issues, not least about relations with the US.

But this does not take away anything from the extraordinary community constituted by the

intellectual and cultural patrimony that unites Europeans around recognized and accepted values. It

is here that Europe has a purpose it can rally around – a message that can resonate powerfully in a

world riven by religious intolerance and fanaticism.

Many of Europe's values – the respect for human life, the desire to protect the weak and the

oppressed, the respect for women, the desire to subject power to laws and principles – arose in the

course of long history in which the influence of Christianity was very significant. But Europe also

found a productive balance between the church and the state.

34

In Europe, sovereignty belongs to the people and does not flow from a transcendent power. Liberty

of thought is absolute, as is religious freedom. Women will not suffer an inferior status with regard to

men. Political representation must be pluralistic. Public powers should not depend or refer to any

religious authority.

All these values are accepted pillars of political and institutional stability in today's Europe, and

command largely unanimous agreement. They were extracted from the churches, not granted by

them. This part of our patrimony comes from the Enlightenment, and

grows out of the old struggle

for the triumph of Reason.

To deepen this set of our values, to test to what extent they are shared is the necessary condition for

generating new values and for giving our Union the identity and cohesion that will one day permit us

to propose Europe's secular values to the rest of the world.

Michel Rocard, a former Prime Minister of France, is a deputy in the European Parliament.

Copyright Project Syndicate / Institute for Human Sciences 2003

35

Islamic Evangelism

by Olivier Roy

Many believe that religious revival and political radicalism among Europe's Muslims reflects the

traditions and conflicts of the Middle East or the wider Muslim world. But Islamic Salafism

(fundamentalist religious radicalism) is above all a consequence of the globalization and

Westernization of Islam, and of the decoupling of culture and religion more generally.

All forms of religious fundamentalism rely on the notion of a "pure" religion independent of

cultural variations and influences. Today's Islamic revival shares the dogmatism, communitarianism,

and scripturalism of American evangelist movements: both reject culture, philosophy, and even

theology to favor a literalist reading of the sacred texts and an immediate understanding of truth

through individual faith.

Recent religious books published in the West reflect this, with titles like *What is Islam?*, *What*

Does It Mean To Be A Muslim?, and *How To Experience Islam?* It is easy to fast during Ramadan in

Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Egypt, even if one does not want to. But a Muslim living in Europe is

confronted with the necessity of objectifying the religion. The *ulemas* (religious scholars) are useless

for believers, who are searching for purely religious criteria that are no longer linked to a given

culture.

The real issue is not an intellectual or theoretical question about Islam, but the religious practices
of Muslims. The forms of religiosity in Islam today are more or less the same as those found in
Catholicism, Protestantism, and even Judaism. Contemporary adherents insist more on personal
faith and individual spiritual experience. Such "born again" believers rebuild their identities from the
perspective of their rediscovery of religion.

With Islamic fundamentalism, too, we are not witnessing a traditional religion asserting itself
against the Christian West. When the Taliban came to power in Afghanistan in 1996, they had an
excellent relationship with the Americans, and Westerners could travel freely in Afghanistan
between 1996 and 1998.

The Taliban were not fighting Western culture, but traditional Afghan culture. Why forbid owning
songbirds? Why ban kites? The rationale was one common to all forms of fundamentalism: this
world exists only to prepare the believer for salvation. The state's role is not to ensure social justice
and the rule of law, but to create opportunities – even if they are coercive – for believers to find their
way to salvation.

The Taliban's argument was simple: if your bird starts singing while you are praying, you will be
distracted and your prayer will be nullified. If you are a good Muslim, you will start again from the
beginning. But, since we are not sure that you are a good Muslim, it is easier to forbid owning
songbirds, so that they cannot jeopardize your salvation.

Similarly, kites get tangled in trees, and if you climb the tree to free it, you might look over your
neighbor's wall and see a woman without her veil, which would put you in a sinful state. Why risk
burning in hell for a kite? Better to ban them.

36

Fundamentalism is thus not a protest by original cultures under threat; it

is the praise of these

cultures' disappearance. So it is a grave mistake to link modern forms of fundamentalism with the

idea of a clash of cultures or civilizations. Young people do not become fundamentalists because

their parents' culture is ignored by Western civilization. Fundamentalist religiosity is individual and

generational, a rebellion *against* the religion of one's parents.

Of course, religious fundamentalists of whatever stripe often emphasize similar codes, norms,

and values. When Pim Fortuyn in Holland decided to wage a campaign against Muslim influence, he

was defending sexual freedom, not traditional Christian values. But on this subject and others –

such as family and abortion – religious Muslims in Europe side with conservative Christians.

Nevertheless, such commonalities do not explain political and radical Islam. Osama Bin Laden is

much more the expression of deracination than of a tradition of political violence in Islam.

Muhammad Atta, Zacharias Moussaoui, and Kamel Daoudi were "born again" in Marseilles, London,

and Montreal, not in Egypt or Morocco (and they all broke ties with their families).

Moreover, young radicals go to fight in Bosnia, Chechnya, Afghanistan, or Kashmir rather than in

their countries of origin, because they do not regard the Middle East as the heart of a Muslim

civilization that is under siege by crusaders. They live in a global world, and they do not perceive

themselves as Middle Easterners.

The irrelevance of traditional culture explains the growing number of converts in all the recently

discovered radical networks. The members of the Beghal network in France were roughly one-third

converts. The French police arrested a German citizen with a Polish name in connection with the

terrorist attack on the synagogue in Djerba, Tunisia. Richard Reid, who tried to blow up a British

airplane, José Padilla, accused of plotting a "dirty bomb" attack in the

United States, and John
Walker Lindh, the American Taliban, are all converts.
In Europe, conversion is typically confined to underprivileged neighborhoods, populated by young
people with no job prospects and who generally live in a small underground economy of
delinquency. The radical and violent left in Europe today has abandoned these zones of social
exclusion. Radicals used to learn to handle a Kalashnikov and hijack planes with the Palestinians.
Now they learn to handle a Kalashnikov and hijack planes with Al Qaeda.
Their quest for mythic, messianic, transnational movements of liberation remains the same, as
does the enemy: the American imperial colossus. They are the product not of Western history or
Middle Eastern history, but the fusion of all histories, of globalization. They are at home in a
homeless world.

Olivier Roy is Research Director at the CNRS; he teaches at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en
Sciences Sociales (EHESS) and at the Institut d'Etudes Politiques, Paris. He is the author of
"Globalized Islam", London (Hurst) 2004.
© Project Syndicate / Institute for Human Sciences, April 2004.
37

Look East To Save Europe's Social Market

by Jacques Rupnik
As expansion of the EU approaches, many Europeans see in it only things to be feared: masses of
economic migrants, and poor countries demanding subsidies. But Europe's new eastern members
can also act as a beacon for the Union, as Jacques Rupnik suggests.
It is often argued that Continental Europe's social and economic model, which seeks to combine
competitiveness with solidarity, is the glue that binds the European Union together, as well as
distinguishing Europe from the American (or Anglo-Saxon) free-market model. Clearly, Europe's
answer to globalization is that certain spheres of social life-say, healthcare, education, the

environment, or culture-cannot be left to the whip of the market.

On the surface it seems that Europe's steady integration proceeded in parallel with the development

of the welfare state. But this is misleading: the European social model is, in fact, part and parcel of

the identity of the EU member states more than of the EU *per se.*

Some, indeed, suggest that the EU often acts to *erode* the welfare state. This fear contributed to the

reluctance of countries like Denmark and Sweden to embrace greater European integration. In both

countries, majorities voted against adopting the euro because they feared that national welfare

norms would become curtailed.

So, across Europe, a key question is this: what is the future of the European "social market" model?

Can it survive once the Union expands from 15 members to 25?

Many EU members look at the newcomers from Central and Eastern Europe and see countries that

largely try to adhere to the liberal, free-market model. Having spent a decade dismantling the debris

of state socialism, most of these countries chafe at the idea of importing the European social

market's idea of solidarity via the EU.

Their position goes beyond political philosophy. A bit of opportunism is also at work, for they

undoubtedly also oppose EU regulation of taxation and social norms, adoption of which would deny

them their comparative advantage for Western investors.

With zero growth and 10% unemployment, Western Europe's "Rhineland model" is no longer what

countries seeking to undertake root-and-branch social and economic reform want to emulate. If

Europe's social market model is to survive enlargement, it must find a way to expand eastward with

the EU. But this can be accomplished only if the model is reformed in the West.

Two factors could help the EU move in the right direction. First, the newcomers share a problem

that undermined the social market model in Western Europe: demographic decline and,

consequently, the prospect of soaring health and pension costs. The populations of the Czech

Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Estonia are aging and declining just as quickly as the

populations of Spain or Italy. So the need to reform health and pension systems is similar in all

38

of these countries.

Second, public attitudes toward the social market system are remarkably similar in both Eastern and

Western Europe. According to the Pew Global Attitude survey, there is a significant degree of

convergence between East-Central Europeans and West Europeans concerning the balance

between the market and a state-guaranteed social safety net.

If the newcomers are to embrace the social market model, that model must operate throughout the

EU and offer to them what it offered new EU members in the past. Sadly, this is not yet the case.

Instead, EU enlargement is being carried out according to what might be described as the principle

of "asymmetrical integration." The asymmetry facilitated an eastward transfer of EU norms and

institutional convergence, but no commensurate transfer of resources. EU regulatory power has

taken precedence over its redistributive powers.

But the Union's regulatory authority is likely to be accepted by the accession countries only if it

remains tied to the redistributionist ethic at the heart of the EU's social model. Regulation without

redistribution could undermine the EU's legitimacy among the newcomers.

A report for the Chair of the EU Commission by a team of experts led by Jacques Sapir argued

explicitly for a reorientation of the Union's "cohesion" policies eastwards, *i.e.*, in favor of those who

most need them. Clearly, if the social market model is to expand eastward – thereby ensuring its

viability within the whole Union – this is the only viable alternative.

But this idea threatens current beneficiaries of EU redistributive policies, namely Spain (which now

gets over a third of Union cohesion funds) and Greece (which gets about a fifth), as well as Ireland.

Countries that benefited most from European solidarity over the past twenty years are thus the least

eager to share with their poor Eastern relations.

The old European social model is in tatters. Its reform – or, rather, its re-invention – implies

redefining what solidarity means, within both the member states and the EU as a whole. But for

reform to succeed, a little old-fashioned solidarity extended Eastwards now is the best way to

ensure the commitment of the EU's newest members to European integration.

Jacques Rupnik is Research Director at CERI, Paris, and Visiting Professor at the College d'Europe

in Bruges.

© Project Syndicate / Institute for Human Sciences, April 2004.

39

Europe's Solidarity under Siege

by Aleksander Smolar

Is the European Union's solidarity fracturing? After bruising enlargement negotiations and internal

differences over Iraq, and with similar divisions surrounding the new EU constitution and the

common European foreign and defense policy, one might well think just that. Public opinion polls

also show a dramatic decline in support for enlargement within the current EU member states.

Whether or not the crisis of European solidarity is real is a fundamental question, because the EU

will not survive without solidarity, at least not as we know it.

The sense of equality and solidarity is a necessary foundation of any democratic community. In the

1950's the British sociologist T. S. Marshall wrote about the progress of rights, from civil rights in the

18th century, to political (democratic) rights in the 19th century, to social rights in the 20th century.

These three dimens-ions - liberal, democratic and social - describe the modern European nation

state.

Solidarity played the most central role in the 20th century. Indeed, it was the driving force behind the
development of the European countries in the wake of World War II, and led to their transformation
into "social states" emphasizing social security and a variety of welfare programs. We can measure
this "institutionalized solidarity" in a nation state by the share of redistribution in its GDP.
There is also another level of solidarity, which we can call universal or global solidarity. Its
importance—reflected in various forms of international aid— has been very limited until now. Its
objective is not to ensure the equality of citizens' rights, but to guarantee minimum life conditions.
Humanitarian inter-ventions—much discussed in the 1990's—are another manifestation of this
global solidarity.
Between citizen solidarity at the nation-state level and humanitarian solidarity on the global level lies
a third level of solidarity which is most interesting for Europeans—the EU level. In its early years the
European Community was mainly concerned with peace, stability and democracy. But
institutionalized solidarity has become increasingly important in European consolidation and intra-
European redistribution played a key role in the modernization of Ireland, Spain, Portugal, and
Greece.
At the same time, the *Zeitgeist* has turned against the ideals of solidarity since the 1970's. Solidarity
has lost ground against new demands of individual freedom, and even more against the imperative
of economic efficiency, which became ever more pressing as a result of globalization. A "revolt of
40
the middle classes" that increasingly refuse to pay for society's "underdogs" is accompanied by
budgetary constraints that can also make solidarity seem a luxury.
The demands of solidarity are even more difficult to sustain when they require inter-state

redistribution. A refusal to carry the transfer costs associated with multinational states contributed to

the "velvet divorce" between the Czech Republic and Slovakia and the dramatic breakdown of ex-

Yugoslavia. Similar tensions exist in some West European countries (Belgium, Spain, Italy) as well.

EU enlargement, with the prospect of increased cross-national redistribution, thus exposes

particularly thorny issues of European solidarity. The promised annual EU payments to the

candidate members are far below those made to current members. Poland, for example, will get

about 67 euros per year per capita during 2004-2006, Hungary will receive 49 euros, and the Czech

Republic will get just 29 euros. By contrast, Greece received 437 euros per capita in 2000, Ireland

got 418 euros, and Portugal was paid 211 euros.

To be sure, Europe, with its sluggish growth, feels less rich than in the past, when the earlier

accession deals were negotiated. But the difference in treatment of the current candidate countries

does not just reflect budgetary problems. The changing attitudes of citizens of the more developed

member states and the weakening of the sense of obligation entailed by solidarity are also

responsible (probably primarily so).

The sense of solidarity between the candidate countries and current EU members is further

weakened by the problem of external security. The accession states only recently regained their

independence, and so retain a feeling of uncertainty as to their security. These jitters contributed to

the support they gave to the US position on Iraq, which in turn provoked the irritation of some

Western European leaders and the decline of public support in the member states for EU

enlargement.

Yet another potentially important source of fraying European solidarity is the changing architecture

of the EU. Status differentiation is progressively replacing the model of

equal rights and obligations
of all mem-ber states. Ten years ago, Wolfgang Schäuble and Karl Lamers suggested the formation
of a "core Europe," a group of countries that would speed up integration among themselves. Similar
ideas, especially concerning security and foreign policy have proliferated ever since. Such a
tendency can contribute to a further weakening of solidarity and deepening of intra-European
divisions.
The process of differentiation—inevitable to some extent, given the number and the diversity of
member states—is also reinforced by the attitude of the new entrants. "Return to Europe" is no
longer the battle cry of the new post-communist democracies. Public debates now focus on financial
support from the EU and the status of individual nation states, rather than European destiny and
41
common European projects.
There are fears on both sides. This is understandable, given the scope of enlargement and the need
for an internal transformation of the Union. But these fears and the atmosphere of suspicion must be
over-come. Mutual trust must be reinforced. The constitutional debate in the next several months
should focus on these major questions: why and how Europe's peoples want to live together. The
concept of solidarity should obviously be central to this debate.
Aleksander Smolar is President of the Stefan Batory Foundation, Warsaw, and Senior Researcher
at the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris.
© Project Syndicate / Institute for Human Sciences 2003
42
Seeking Sovereignty, in Iraq and Europe
by Charles Taylor
Two very different efforts at "nation building" are galvanizing world attention: America's struggle to
construct a viable polity in Iraq and the EU's ambitious project of making Europe into a true "Union."

While many issues involved are distinct, there is a question of "democratic deficit" in both
undertakings. Why and what will it take to overcome it?

Sovereign regimes require a political identity. To understand this, let's reflect on a few
considerations with a distinctly Rousseauian flavor. I make no apology for this. Jean-Jacques
Rousseau was the conflicted genius who first articulated many basic themes of modernity, from
democracy through authenticity, with all their contradictory demands. He is a great thinker, whose
advice is always disastrous to follow.

The first modern, democratic revolutions transferred power from the monarch to the "nation" or the
"people." But this required inventing a new kind of collective agency that can decide and act
together, to which one can attribute a "will." This new entity requires strong cohesion, because
popular sovereignty means more than simply the will of the majority.

All sorts of bodies, even the loosest aggregations, can adopt majority decision-making. Suppose
that during a public lecture, some people feel hot and ask that the windows be opened; others
disagree. One might decide the matter by a show of hands, with the minority accepting the outcome
favored by the majority as legitimate. Yet the audience might be comprised of individuals unknown
to one another, without mutual concern, brought together only by that event.

Democratic societies need something more. They need to be bonded more powerfully than some
chance grouping.

Popular sovereignty entails certain types of decision procedures — grounded ultimately on the will of
the majority (restricted by respect for liberty and individual rights) — and offers a particular
justification for collective decisionmaking. Under a regime of popular sovereignty, we are free in a
way that we are not under an absolute monarch or an entrenched aristocracy.

To see why, consider such a regime from an individual's standpoint. Say that I am outvoted on

some important issue. I must abide by an outcome I oppose. My will is thwarted, so why should I

consider myself free? Why does it matter that it is the majority of my fellow citizens, rather than the

decisions of a monarch, that is overriding my will?

43

Indeed, we can even imagine that a potential monarch, waiting to return to power in a coup, agrees

with me on the issue in question. Wouldn't I then be freer after a counter-revolution? After all, my will

would then be put into effect – at least on this matter.

This question is not merely theoretical. It is rarely put on behalf of individuals, but it regularly arises

for sub-groups, such as national minorities, who see themselves as oppressed by majorities.

Perhaps no answer can satisfy them. Whatever one says or does, they may be unable to see

themselves as part of a larger sovereign people. They therefore see its rule over them as

illegitimate, which is precisely the point: the logic of popular sovereignty requires an idea of

collective agency based on a sense of individual belonging that is much stronger than in our lecture

audience.

Of course, some extreme philosophical individualists believe that appeals to some greater collective

is pure humbug, concocted to get voters to accept voluntary servitude. But without deciding this

philosophical issue, we can ask: what feature of our "imagined communities" persuades people to

accept that they are free under a democratic regime, even when their will is overridden on important

issues?

The answer that we as individuals accept is that we are free because we rule ourselves in common,

rather than being ruled by some agency that need not take account of us. Our freedom consists in

having a guaranteed voice in the sovereign, in being heard and

participating in making decisions.

We enjoy this freedom because of a law that enfranchises all of us, so that we enjoy this freedom

together. Our freedom is realized and defended by this law, whether or not we win or lose any

particular decision. This law also defines the community whose freedom it realizes and defends—a

collective agency, a people, whose acting together by the law preserves their freedom.

Such is the answer, valid or not, that people accept in democratic societies—an answer can that

requires accepting a kind of belonging much stronger than that of the lecture hall. It is an *ongoing*

collective agency, membership in which delivers something vital: a kind of freedom. Insofar as this

is crucial to their identity, people identify strongly with this agency—the "nation" or the "people"—and

hence feel a bond with their co-participants in it. Only an appeal to this kind of membership can

rebut the challenge of those considering support for a monarch's or general's or provisional

government's coup in the name of their freedom.

The crucial point is that regardless of who is right philosophically, it is only insofar as people accept

some such appeal that the legitimacy principle that underlies popular sovereignty can work to secure

their consent. If identification with the community is rejected, the government will be illegitimate in

the eyes of the rejecters. There can be no democracy without a shared identity as participants in a

common agency.

44

This notion underscores the central challenge now posed by both the Iraqi and European projects.

Simply put, are Iraqis too divided, too long oppressed, to develop anything like the sense of common

identity and collective agency that popular sovereignty requires?

Much less is, in some ways, at stake in building a new democratic community out of the already free

and prosperous European countries. But whether the "democratic

deficit"on the European level be

remedied also depends on whether a shared European identity can be forged out of the 25 nations

that will soon make up the European Union. Both projects are audacious. Neither is guaranteed

success.

Charles Taylor is Professor for Philosophy and Law, Northwestern University, Chicago, and

Professor emeritus for Philosophy, McGill University, Montreal.

© Project Syndicate / Institute for Human Sciences 2003

Die Beiträge der letzten beiden Hefte von Transit stehen im Zusammenhang mit der

Arbeit der vom IWM gebildeten Reflexionsgruppe über die geistige und kulturelle

Dimension Europas (vgl. www.iwm.at/t-26txt1.htm sowie www.iwm.at/r-reflec.htm).

Sie gehen z.T. auf öffentliche Debatten der Gruppe zurück, die in Brüssel, Warschau,

Wien, Paris und Berlin stattfanden.

Borderlines. Photographien
Olivier Roy
Konflikt der Religionen oder Konvergenz der Religiositäten?
Tariq Modood
Muslime und Multikulturalismus in Europa
Dieter Oberndörfer
Politische Integration und kulturelle Freiheit
Farhad Khosrokhavar
Muslime im Gefängnis. Der Fall Frankreich
Europäische Verbindlichkeiten II
Schwierige Freundschaft:
Die erweiterte EU und die USA
Religionen und europäische
Solidarität II
Islam in Europa
B e s t e l l u n g e n a u c h ü b e r s We b : w w w . i w m . a t / t r a n s i
t . h t m

Note 3

Culture contributes to 2.6% of EU's GDP and employs at least 5.8 million Europeans, says a study published today in Brussels

Reference: IP/06/1564   Date: 15/11/2006

IP/06/1564

Brussels, 15 November 2006

Culture contributes to 2.6% of EU's GDP and employs at least 5.8 million Europeans, says a study published today in Brussels

In a study presented to the EU's Ministers of Culture on 13 November, the European Commission shows the importance of the culture sector for the EU economy, and underlines its potential for creating more and better jobs in the future. With its 5.8 million employees, the Culture sector employs more

persons than the total employed in Greece and Ireland put together. Further, the culture sector accounted for 2.6% of EU GDP in 2003, and experiences higher growth rates than the average of other sectors of the economy.

The independent study, commissioned by the European Commission, was published on 13 November. In presenting the results to the EU Member States' Culture Ministers, Ján Figel', European Commissioner for Education, Training, Culture, and Multilingualism, said: *"This study helps break the conventional wisdom on the culture and creative Sector. It confirms that the arts and culture are far from being marginal in terms of their economic contribution. Indeed, they are a major employer, and as a sector, the culture and arts contribute to innovation and the economic and social development of the EU, its regions and cities. The culture sector is the engine of creativity, and creativity is the basis for social and economic innovation. As such, I firmly believe that the EU's arts and culture are a dynamic economic and social driver for achieving more growth, and more and better jobs."*

The document highlights the direct (in terms of GDP, growth and employment) as well as the indirect (links between creativity and innovation, links with the ICT sector, regional development and attractiveness) contribution of the cultural and creative sectors towards the Lisbon Agenda. The main findings of the study include:

In **economic terms**:

- the sector contributed **2.6% of EU GDP in 2003**, exceeding the contribution of the chemicals, rubber and plastic products industry (at 2.3%)
- it is performing well by increasing its share of economic activity;
- the sector's growth between 1999 and 2003 was 12.3% higher than the growth of the European economy in general;
- its **turn-over** was more than **€ 654 billion in 2003**.

In **social terms**:

- **5.8 million people** - in 2004 - worked in the sector, equivalent to **3.1% of total employed population** in EU-25, more than the total employed in Ireland and Greece put together;
- whereas total employment in the EU decreased in 2002-2004, employment in the sector increased (+1.85%) over the same period.

The study proves therefore that spending money on culture is a sound investment.

The study also calls for a **coherent strategy for the creative sector** and includes a **set of policy recommendations** intended to unleash the "Lisbon potential" of the cultural economy in Europe.

The proposed future strategy is composed of three main strands:

- to **improve intelligence gathering of statistical evidence** on the importance of the cultural sector in Europe;
- to **increase its contribution to the Lisbon strategy's goals through a more intensive use of the EU's programmes,** fostering creativity, clustering technology and creation in joint platforms, promoting investment in cultural industries, and integrating the cultural dimension in international cooperation agreements between the EU and third countries;
- structural reform via strengthened coordination of activities and policies impacting on the cultural and creative sector within the European Commission.

The study will feed into the **Spring European Lisbon Summit in 2007**.

This document will also be a key input in the forthcoming Communication on the role of Culture in Europe to be adopted next year.The study's executive summary as well as the full text are available at :

http://ec.europa.eu/culture/eac/index_en.htmlFor more information on the EU's actions in the cultural area:

http://ec.europa.eu/culture/eac/index_en.html